

Iowa State Board of Education

Executive Summary

June 18, 2026

Agenda Item: University of Iowa Educator Preparation Program Approval Report

State Board Goal(s): Goal 3

State Board Role/Authority: The State Board of Education sets standards and approves practitioner preparation programs based on those standards. Iowa Code section 256.7(s) and Iowa Administrative Code chapter 281-79.

Presenter(s): Stephanie TeKippe, Program Consultant
Office of Educator Quality

Mark McDermott, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Education and Educator Preparation
University of Iowa

Attachment(s): One

Recommendation: It is recommended that the State Board award full approval to the University of Iowa educator preparation programs through the next review scheduled for the 2031-2032 academic year.

Background: The University of Iowa offers teacher, administrator, professional school counseling, school psychology, speech-language pathology, school social work, school audiologist and paraeducator preparation programs. The University of Iowa's education department has provided evidence that all programs are in compliance with Iowa Administrative Code chapter 79. Additionally, they have demonstrated compliance with the Bureau of Educational Examiners' requirements for each endorsement and program offered through the institution.

Educator Preparation Program Approval Report

University of Iowa

Site Visit: April 6-9, 2025

Presented to the Iowa State Board of Education: June 18, 2026



Department of Education

State of Iowa
Department of Education
Grimes State Office Building
400 E. 14th Street
Des Moines, IA 50319-0146
State of Iowa

State Board of Education

John Robbins, Iowa Falls
Todd Abrahamson, Arnolds Park
Cassandra Halls, Carlisle
Jeff Henderson, Hiawatha
Jeremy Lindquist, Des Moines
Mary Meisterling, Cedar Rapids
Erica Roth, Sioux Center
Beth Townsend, Director, Iowa Workforce Development
Cecelia Harris, Student Member, Spirit Lake

Administration

McKenzie Snow, Director and Executive
Officer of the State Board of Education

Division of Teacher Quality and Innovation

Jay Pennington, Administrator

Office of Educator Quality

Maryam Rod Szabo, Administrative Consultant
Stephanie TeKippe, Education Program Consultant
Lindsay Harrison, Education Program Consultant
Amy Mayer, Education Program Consultant

It is the policy of the Iowa Department of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, sexual orientation, national origin, sex, disability, religion, age, political party affiliation, or actual or potential parental, family or marital status in its programs, activities, or employment practices as required by the Iowa Code sections 216.9 and 256.10(2), Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d2000e), the Equal Pay Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 206, et seq.), Title IX (Educational Amendments, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1681 – 1688), Section 504 (Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. § 794), and the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.). If you have questions or complaints related to compliance with this policy by the Iowa Department of Education, please contact the legal counsel for the Iowa Department of Education, Grimes State Office Building, 400 E. 14th Street, Des Moines, IA 50319-0146, telephone number: 515-281-5295, or the Director of the Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, Cesar E. Chavez Memorial Building, 1244 Speer Boulevard, Suite 310, Denver, CO 80204-3582, telephone number: 303-844-5695, TDD number: 800-877-8339, email: OCR.Denver@ed.gov

Contents

Program..... 4

Recommendation..... 5

Executive Summary..... 6

University of Iowa Overview..... 15

Program Trends..... 18

Program Review Fast Facts..... 22

Full Initial Site Visit Report with Institution Responses 27

Program

University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

University of Iowa Program Representatives

Dan Clay, Dean, College of Education
Mark McDermott, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Education and Educator Preparation
Dave Tingwald, Licensure and Standards Coordinator
Betsy Justis, Educational Licensure Specialist

University of Iowa Review Team Members

Maryam Rod Szabo, Iowa Department of Education
Stephanie TeKippe, Iowa Department of Education
Erica Woods-Schmitz, Iowa Department of Education
Lindsay Harrison, Iowa Department of Education
Amy Mayer, Iowa Department of Education
Joanne Tubbs, Iowa Department of Education
Dana Oswald, William Penn University
Angela Rekers, St. Ambrose University
Tanya Volkova, St. Ambrose University
Alex Hansen, Upper Iowa University
Jaime Boeckman, Iowa State University
Hilarie Welsh, Loras College
Lisa Chizek, Iowa State University
Scott Scheuerell, Loras College
Tim Gilson, University of Northern Iowa
Elliott Johnson, Luther College
Bengu Erguner-Tekinalp, Drake University
Missy Springsteen Haupt, Iowa State University
Jeffrey Haverland, University of Dubuque
Larry Bice, Iowa State University
Chad Biermeier, University of Dubuque
Joel Carter, Emmaus Bible College
Benjamin Forsyth, University of Northern Iowa
Brittany Garling, Buena Vista University
Linda Lind, Iowa State University
Dana Oswald, William Penn University
Michele Swanson, University of Northern Iowa
Carrie Thonstad, Northwestern College

Recommendation to the Board

Program	Recommendation
Teacher Preparation Program	Full Approval
Administrative Preparation Program	Full Approval
Professional School Counseling Program	Full Approval
School Psychology Program	Full Approval
Speech-Language Pathology Program	Full Approval
School Social Work Program	Full Approval
School Audiologist Program	Full Approval
Paraeducator Program	Full Approval

Executive Summary

The executive summary includes strengths, recommendations for continuous improvement and resolved concerns. All standards are considered in compliance after review of program resolutions. The resolution of concerns is monitored for continued compliance at the one-year follow-up visit and through required annual report submissions for three years after approval.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Iowa State Board of Education (State Board) grant full approval for University of Iowa's educator preparation programs.

University of Iowa's education unit has demonstrated compliance with state requirements for offering high-quality preparation programs. They effectively addressed initial concerns or presented detailed plans for resolution in the coming months including a clear timeline and strategy. The unit responded promptly and devised an action plan to implement recommendations.

It is important to note that recommendations are intended solely for the program's continuous enhancement and often surpass basic standards, there is no immediate action necessary beyond a thoughtful response. Concerns will be revisited annually over the next three years following program approval. Additionally, the recommendations and concerns identified in this review will be reevaluated during the subsequent site visit cycle as part of our commitment to continuous improvement.

Governance and Resources Standard

The Governance and Resources standard is considered met.

Strengths. The team commended the unit for strengthening communication and training for all instructors through the implementation of a video channel supported by technology personnel who provided resources and training regularly and when requested. The educational leadership program sustained strong, consistent collaboration with its advisory committee through leadership's personal and responsive approach, as shown by high attendance and active participation that informed continuous program improvement. The unit also demonstrated a commitment to excellence by going beyond compliance through the intentional development, alignment and integration of its core principles with the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards and across all programs. This coordinated effort reflected a program-wide dedication to embedding those principles in meaningful, purposeful ways.

Recommendations. The review identified several recommendations to strengthen consistency, governance and instructional quality across programs and the unit responded with clear actions and plans. To address inconsistencies in educational leadership courses, the unit began work with instructional designers to develop a consistent course template for implementation beginning fall 2026. The unit also formalized advisory oversight for professional service programs by establishing a Professional Service Advisory Committee in spring 2025 and committed to holding and documenting semiannual meetings with expanded program representation.

In response to recommendations about instructional coverage in the teaching and learning program, the unit communicated staffing needs to college leadership and continued to request additional visiting or permanent faculty while enhancing onboarding and support for adjunct instructors. The unit further strengthened instructional quality by improving adjunct onboarding, clarifying evaluation and feedback processes for course supervisors and advocating at the university level for broader access to student teaching survey data. Finally, the college advanced an ongoing effort to clearly define and document program coordinator roles related to governance, assessment and Iowa Administrative Code chapter 79 (Chapter 79) compliance across educator preparation and professional service programs.

Concerns. The review identified several Chapter 79 compliance concerns related to program coherence, alignment and consistency and the unit responded with documented actions and plans. For

administrator preparation, the program acknowledged the need to update its conceptual framework and provided a draft framework, timeline and action steps supported by a structured faculty review process grounded in current literature. To address alignment of the dyslexia specialist endorsement, the unit submitted revised syllabi and a detailed crosswalk demonstrating alignment with International Dyslexia Association (IDA) standards as previously approved and implemented.

The review also noted the need for more intentional and sustained collaboration with content faculty, particularly within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) and Special Education. In response, the unit described ongoing and expanded structures for cross-college collaboration, faculty governance participation and targeted efforts to integrate expertise and messaging across programs. Finally, to address differences in candidate experiences across delivery formats in a special education foundations course, the unit revised course content, aligned online and face-to-face experiences with instructional design support and planned increased in-person capacity to provide candidates with greater choice and comparable quality.

Diversity Standard

The Diversity standard is considered met.

Strengths. The review team commended the unit for intentional and purposeful faculty hiring practices that prioritized expertise, passion and a commitment to a supportive learning environment with varying backgrounds and perspectives. Interviews with university leadership, faculty and students further demonstrated that the unit fostered exposure to a diversity of thought that supported an intellectually rich environment and promoted cognitive growth across the university community.

Recommendations. The review acknowledged the educational leadership program's commitment to diversity through its rural administrator preparation initiative and recommended expanding recruitment strategies to strengthen the rural leadership pipeline. In response, the unit planned to collaborate with university leadership and the Iowa Department of Education (Department) to explore participation in the Grow Your Own (GYO) Principal Preparation Pathway and to identify rural district partners for future implementation. The review also noted that the requirements of full-time program structures, while supporting strong clinical experiences, limited access for some working professionals. The unit clarified that flexible, part-time pathways were available in programs such as school counseling and were communicated through admissions and ongoing advising.

There were no concerns in the Diversity standard.

Faculty Standard

The Faculty standard is considered met.

Strengths. The review team commended the leadership of Mark McDermott for fostering a supportive environment for faculty and for responding effectively to identified needs and opportunities for improvement. Examples included the creation of a position dedicated to student support, the implementation of weekly lunch meetings for new faculty and the provision of ongoing, responsive professional development opportunities. The unit also demonstrated a strong commitment to faculty development by offering multiple, well-supported pathways for professional growth, particularly for instructor advancement, reflecting a strategic investment in instructional excellence and long-term program quality. Candidates consistently valued faculty expertise, the depth and quality of feedback and the accessibility, responsiveness and flexibility demonstrated by faculty.

Recommendations. While adjunct faculty in the educational leadership and teacher education programs (TEP) received onboarding and ongoing communication, these processes were not formally standardized across programs. To strengthen consistency and clarity, the review team recommended development of a unit-wide, standardized onboarding process for all part-time faculty. In response, the unit indicated that the associate dean for undergraduate education and educator preparation had

established and communicated clear onboarding expectations to departmental administrators, provided documentation of current onboarding practices and ensured adjunct faculty were included in training and information sessions, with recorded materials made available for continued access.

Concerns. The program review identified several compliance concerns regarding faculty qualifications, professional development and ongoing instructional engagement. The team was unable to confirm alignment of teaching duties with faculty preparation, knowledge and experience for multiple instructors and required the unit to provide curriculum vitae or resumes, as well as a plan to ensure appropriate preparation for teaching assignments. In response, the unit submitted documentation for 28 instructors, clarified that misaligned teaching duties had been corrected and confirmed remaining instructors were qualified for their roles. The review also found current faculty lacked documented expertise to deliver the dyslexia specialist curriculum, particularly in assessing cognitive-linguistic markers of dyslexia. The unit responded by providing a detailed table summarizing faculty qualifications for the program.

Additional concerns included the absence of a process to track faculty professional growth and evidence that some faculty had not met the 40-hour co-teaching requirement. The team required development of policies and plans to address these gaps. The unit responded by updating the TEP annual program checklist to include documentation of professional development, incorporating reporting into the university's web-based documentation portal and providing verification by the associate dean. Plans for individual faculty to achieve compliance with the 40-hour requirement were documented.

Assessment Standard

The Assessment standard is considered met.

Strengths. The review team commended the unit for its transparent and comprehensive documentation of program entry, completion and student progress tracking. These practices supported effective collaboration among faculty and staff and demonstrated a well-developed approach to record management and continuous oversight.

Recommendations. The program review determined the unit needed to proactively plan for Tk20's phase-out due to the end of vendor support. The review recommended development of a transition plan to replace or rebuild the assessment data infrastructure. In response, the unit reported that a cross-functional working group had been established to evaluate potential replacement platforms, develop an implementation timeline and ensure continuity of assessment systems prior to the contract's expiration. The review also found candidates experienced confusion between the InTASC standards and the unit's core principles. While the unit has ensured alignment of these principles and InTASC standards, the review team recommended clearer differentiation and communication. The unit indicated that instructional materials in introductory courses were being reviewed to improve clarity regarding the distinct purpose and use of each framework.

Additionally, the review recommended improved communication and clearer articulation of transfer pathways. The unit reported continued collaboration with community college advisors, development of informational videos and ongoing review of website content to support clearer and more consistent messaging. Finally, the team recommend dyslexia specialist endorsement program could be completed in multiple sequences with limited prerequisites and proposed consideration of course sequencing and clearer articulation. In response, the unit submitted a revised curriculum exhibit and indicated that future program planning would include faculty consideration of course sequencing and prerequisite structures.

Concerns. The team found that while teacher preparation programs had well-developed assessment systems, comparable practices were not consistently implemented in administrator and other professional preparation programs. The unit was required to strengthen assessment practices, including standardization, interrater reliability and consistent collection and analysis of candidate and program data. Additionally, the team found that some programs, such as school social work and

speech-language pathology, had not fully developed processes to collect feedback from graduates and employers to inform program improvement.

In response, the unit reported plans to implement structured sessions for faculty and staff across all educator preparation programs to share assessment expectations, data trends and best practices. Workshops on standardization, validation and interrater reliability were scheduled and the development of common rubrics and secure data systems was scheduled to align assessment practices with those in the teacher preparation. The unit also planned to use the Professional Service Advisory Committee to establish timelines and procedures for administering graduate and employer surveys.

Teacher Clinical Practice Standard

The Clinical standard is considered met.

Strengths. The unit was recognized for a well-designed elementary reading practicum model, integrating concurrent methods instruction, a practicum seminar and weekly supervisor observations to strengthen candidate preparation prior to student teaching. The team also noted the involvement of a student support coordinator to assist candidates experiencing academic or personal challenges as both a valuable resource for students and an effective support for faculty.

Recommendations. The program review found several secondary program candidates engaged in lesson planning and teaching in clinical settings prior to completing related methods coursework. The team recommended examining the sequencing of pedagogy courses and field experiences to ensure methods instruction occurred before or concurrently with clinical application. In response, the unit reported that all secondary teacher preparation programs included supervised pre student teaching clinical experiences delivered through practicum courses and embedded clinical components. As part of ongoing continuous improvement efforts, the unit was working to ensure each program included at least two pre student teaching clinical experiences aligned with instruction in teaching methods, planning and assessment, with structured opportunities for candidate reflection.

There were no concerns in the Teacher Clinical Practice standard.

Teacher Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Standard

The Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions standard is considered met.

Strengths. The review team commended the unit for providing candidates with strong opportunities to develop competency in the professional core, including intentional and effective supports for those who initially struggled through structured goal setting, progress monitoring, learning contracts and advising services. The team also recognized the valuable contributions of the Baker Teacher Leader Center in enhancing candidate development and professional growth.

Recommendations. The program review noted concerns regarding potential overlap between the reading endorsement courses and the K-12 dyslexia specialist endorsement, which could affect the intended rigor of each program. The team recommended collaborative evaluation of the programs. In response, the unit clarified that there was no current overlap in course requirements and that revised curriculum exhibits had been submitted reflecting the approved dyslexia specialist program structure, with practicum courses restricted to candidates admitted to the K-12 dyslexia specialist endorsement.

In addition, the team found while candidates received instruction on individualized education programs (IEPs) in ECTL:4900 Foundations of Special Education, alumni and current candidates indicated a need for additional hands-on experiences with IEPs. The unit reported that IEP instruction had been communicated to course instructors, with teacher candidates reviewing examples and completing application activities and cooperating teachers were being encouraged to provide practical experiences. The review team acknowledged this effort to “close the loop” and suggested consideration of a

formalized process within clinical experiences to ensure all candidates gain direct, applied practice with IEPs.

Concerns. The team found compliance concerns within the elementary and special education content of the TEP. It was determined not all candidates were receiving explicit instruction on behaviors related to substance use disorder. The review required the unit to integrate this content into the core curriculum. In response, the special education faculty updated the relevant module in EDTL:4900 Foundations of Special Education beginning in winter 2025 to explicitly address substance use disorders and revised the syllabus accordingly.

Additional concerns were related to literacy preparation. Stakeholder feedback indicated candidates would benefit from enhanced instruction in phonics and explicit reading strategies prior to practical application. The review required the unit to analyze and revise course content, materials and sequencing to strengthen preparation. In response, elementary education literacy faculty began a comprehensive review of course objectives, materials and instruction for EDTL:3160 Primary Reading and Language Arts Methods, K-3 and EDTL:3164 Intermediate Reading and Language Arts Methods, 3-6, starting in summer 2025. The revision included alignment with TEP core principles, standards-based objectives, course activities and concepts from the Iowa Literacy Educator Preparation Workbook (Workbook), while ensuring compliance with Chapter 79 literacy provisions, including exclusion of the three-cueing approach. Updates to syllabi, instructional materials and course schedules have been implemented each semester and preliminary Foundations of Reading Test (FoRT) scores indicate performance above the state average. The unit plans to continue analyzing formative and summative data for curricular improvements.

Administrator Clinical Practice Standard

The Clinical standard is considered met.

Strengths. The program review highlighted the educational policy and leadership studies (EPLS) faculty for designing clinical experiences that immersed participants in a broad range of leadership roles and settings. Candidates experienced both diverse leadership styles and strategies. These experiences strengthened candidates' capacity to evaluate, adapt and apply effective leadership approaches across varied educational contexts.

Concerns. The program review identified compliance concerns related to the structure and tracking of clinical experiences. The team found mid-point conversations between candidates and university supervisors had been the only formalized assessment involving cooperating administrators and required the unit to implement a plan ensuring that both university supervisors and cooperating administrators share responsibility for evaluating candidate performance. In response, the unit developed the Clinical Collaborative Assessment (CCA), which engages the candidate, cooperating administrator and university supervisor in evaluating progress on the National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) standards. The CCA was implemented in all master's program semester-long clinical experiences in fall 2025 and began implementation in the educational leadership with superintendent endorsement (EdS) program, with full adoption planned for spring 2026 and subsequent semesters.

Additional concerns involved tracking candidate experiences across multiple educational settings and diverse student populations. The team required the unit to maintain and utilize a robust tracking system. In response, the program enhanced its web-based hours log within TK20 to document clinical hours and specify student populations and grade levels for each experience. Faculty also maintain a clinical placement form for each candidate that summarizes completed clinical hours, school placement, administrator and university supervisor information and is retained in the candidate's permanent file. These measures were intended to ensure consistent assessment and comprehensive tracking of clinical experiences across all program sites.

Administrator Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Standard

The Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions standard is considered met.

Strengths. The review team commended the educational leadership team for its ongoing and systematic review of candidate needs across courses and throughout the program. Responsive adjustments strengthened candidate preparation and demonstrated a proactive commitment to continuous improvement.

Concerns. The team found that, although instruction addressed students struggling with literacy, including those with dyslexia, this content was not explicitly reflected in the course syllabus. The unit was required to update the syllabus to demonstrate preparation for developing and maintaining a supportive environment for literacy practices. In response, the faculty revised the EPLS:6236 syllabus to specify coverage of literacy and dyslexia within multiple course topics, including referral and evaluation, placement and continuum of services, accountability and disproportionality, student behavior and discipline and support for special education staff. The updated syllabus was provided to the review team.

Professional School Counseling Clinical Practice Standard

The Clinical standard is considered met.

Recommendations. The team found the professional school counseling program demonstrated clear alignment of course competencies and goals with state and national standards. However, the team recommended the unit extend its existing curriculum map to include alignment with state standards. In response, the school counseling faculty reported that they would develop a curriculum map incorporating state standards.

There were no concerns in the Professional School Counseling Clinical Practice standard.

Professional School Counseling Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Standard

The Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions standard is considered met.

Strengths. The program review noted all faculty members in the program possessed prior school counseling experience. This professional background positively informed instruction and enriched candidates' preparation by grounding coursework in authentic, practice-based perspectives with a strong educational focus.

There were no recommendations or concerns in the Professional School Counseling Knowledge Skills and Dispositions standard.

School Psychology Clinical Practice Standard

The Clinical standard is considered met.

Strengths. The program review found all faculty members in the professional school counseling program had prior school counseling experience. This shared professional background enhanced instructional quality and strengthened candidate preparation by consistently connecting coursework to authentic, practice-based applications within educational settings.

Recommendations. The review team noted the school psychology program demonstrated clear alignment of course competencies and goals with state and national standards. It was recommended the unit extend its existing curriculum map to incorporate alignment with state standards. In response, the school psychology faculty reported that they would develop a curriculum map including state standards.

There were no concerns in the School Psychology Clinical Practice standard.

School Psychology Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Standard

The Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions standard is considered met.

There were no recommendations or concerns in the School Psychology Knowledge Skills and Dispositions standard.

School Social Work Clinical Practice Standard

The Clinical standard is considered met.

Strengths. The program review recognized the school social work program for its redesign of the clinical assessment system in response to candidate feedback, demonstrating a strong commitment to continuous improvement. The review also noted the dedication of school social work faculty to maintaining high-quality preparation across multiple instructional modalities offered statewide, ensuring consistent program rigor and accessibility for candidates.

Recommendations. The team found inconsistencies in the quality of clinical placements for school social work candidates when they were responsible for identifying their own practicum sites. The team recommended evaluating the practicum placement process and developing a network of school districts with appropriately licensed school social workers to ensure equitable, high-quality experiences for all candidates. To address these challenges, the program established new relationships with Area Education Agencies (AEA) and schools to expand placement options and implemented an online practicum management system.

Concerns. The review found practicum instructors were solely responsible for scoring competencies, providing narrative feedback and assigning grades. The unit was required to implement a process ensuring shared responsibility with university personnel. In response, the program clarified that evaluation involves multiple university faculty members: a university supervisor monitors and approves the practicum instructor's competency scores and feedback, a practicum administrator assigns the final course grade based on this input and a concurrent practicum seminar instructor provides additional assessment of integrated practicum assignments. This structure ensures shared responsibility.

The team also found the program lacked evidence that clinical placements consistently included diverse student populations and age groups and required a process to collect and document this information. The program responded by implementing a new learning plan for practicum in school social work, requiring candidates to report on the schools, grade levels and basic demographic data, including free and reduced lunch rates. Practicum administrators review this data each semester and if a placement is insufficiently diverse, they work with the liaison and practicum instructor to identify additional opportunities to ensure candidates engage with diverse populations.

School Social Work Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Standard

The Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions standard is considered met.

Recommendations. The program review identified an opportunity to differentiate content in professional education courses for school social work candidates. The team recommended collaboration between the College of Education (CoE) and school social work faculty to identify alternative assignments and course variations that would allow candidates to engage with general education, special education and elective content through a social work lens. In response, the unit noted that current education course requirements were selected for relevance to school social work practice and are designed for all licensure students. The program indicated it would continue to explore potential differentiation through the Professional Service Advisory Committee.

There were no concerns in the School Social Work Knowledge Skills and Dispositions standard.

Speech Language Pathology Clinical Practice Standard

The Clinical standard is considered met.

There were no recommendations or concerns in the Speech Language Pathology Clinical Practice standard.

Speech Language Pathology Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Standard

The Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions standard is considered met.

Recommendations. The team recommended developing a crosswalk of program competencies to identify opportunities to reduce credit requirements, making the program more approachable for candidates. In response, the unit reported plans to collaboratively review speech language pathology courses to determine whether they address additional licensure competencies that could substitute for CoE courses.

There were no concerns in the Speech Language Pathology Knowledge Skills and Dispositions standard.

School Audiologist Clinical Practice Standard

The Clinical standard is considered met.

There were no recommendations or concerns in the School Audiologist Clinical Practice standard.

School Audiologist Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Standard

The Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions standard is considered met.

Recommendations. The team recommended developing a crosswalk of program competencies embedded in current courses to identify where content is already exists, resulting in a potential reduction in credits that could make the program more accessible. In response, the unit reported plans to conduct a collaborative review of the program's courses to determine whether they address additional school licensure competencies that could substitute for CoE courses and indicated that an update would be provided at the one-year follow-up visit.

There were no concerns in the School Audiologist Knowledge Skills and Dispositions standard.

Paraeducator Organizational and Resources Standard

The Organizational and Resources standard is considered met.

Strengths. The unit has a variant of the paraeducator program for students in the University of Iowa's Realizing Educational and Career Hopes program (UI REACH). The UI REACH is a comprehensive transition program for college-age students with intellectual, cognitive and learning disabilities. Career development is an area of focus within the program and this path allows students to meet program expectations using accommodations and differentiation.

There were no recommendations or concerns in the Organizational and Resources standard.

Paraeducator Diversity Standard

The Diversity standard is considered met.

There were no recommendations or concerns in the Diversity standard.

Paraeducator Faculty Standard

The Faculty standard is considered met.

There were no recommendations or concerns in the Faculty standard.

Paraeducator Program Assessment and Evaluation Standard

The Program Assessment and Evaluation standard is considered met.

There were no recommendations or concerns in the Program Assessment and Evaluation standard.

Paraeducator Clinical Practice Standard

The Clinical Practice standard is considered met.

There were no recommendations or concerns in the Clinical Practice standard.

University of Iowa Overview

Source: U.S. Department of Education Scorecard, University of Iowa

General Information

Type:	Public Regent Institution of Higher Education
Size:	Large
Location:	City
Awards Offered:	Bachelor's, Master's, Doctoral, First Professional Degrees, Graduate/Professional Certificates and Undergraduate Certificate or Diploma

Cost

Avg. Annual Cost:	\$22,531 (midpoint for 4-year schools is \$20,081 year)
-------------------	---

Acceptance Rate, Enrollment, Retention and Graduation Rate

Acceptance Rate:	84%
Enrollment:	22,264 undergraduate students
Retention Rate:	90% (% of students returning after the first year)
Graduation Rate:	72% (midpoint for 4-year schools is 59%)

Student and Faculty Ratio

Student-to-Faculty Ratio:	16:1
---------------------------	------

Programs and Endorsements Offered

Awards Offered:	Bachelor's, Master's, Doctoral, First Professional Degree, Graduate/Professional Certificate and Undergraduate Certificate or Diploma
Main Campus:	Iowa City, IA

Education Programs

Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Administration, Professional School Counseling, School Psychology, School Social Work, Speech-Language Pathology, School Audiologist, Paraeducator

Endorsements Offered

K-6: Teacher Elementary Classroom*

K-8: Art*, English/Language Arts*, Chinese*, French*, German*, Japanese*, Latin*, Russian*, Spanish*, Language (Other)*, Mathematics*, Music*, Physical Education*, Reading*, Science (Basic)*, Social Studies*, Speech, Professional School Counselor*, Italian*, Instructional Strategist 1: Mild & Moderate*, Elementary School Teacher Librarian*

5-8: Algebra for H.S. Credit, Middle School Language Arts*, Middle School Mathematics*, Middle School Science*, Middle School Social Studies*

5-12: Art*, English/Language Arts*, Language Arts – All*, Chinese*, French*, German*, Japanese*, Latin*, Russian*, Spanish*, Language (Other)*, Mathematics*, Music*, Reading*, Biological Science*, Chemistry*, Earth Science*, Basic Science*, Physics*, American Government*, American History*, Anthropology*, Economics*, Geography*, Psychology*, Sociology*, World History*, Professional School Counselor*, Italian*, All Science*, All Social Science*, Social Sciences – Basic*, Instructional Strategist 1: Mild & Moderate*, Secondary School Teacher Librarian*

K-12: Coaching, English as a Second Language*, Reading Specialist*, Dyslexia Specialist, Instructional Strategist II: BD/LD*

PK-12: Talented and Gifted*, Superintendent & AEA Administrator, Principal/PK-12 Special Education Supervisor, School Teacher Librarian*

B-21: School Psychologist, Speech Language Pathologist, School Social Worker, School Audiologist
Paraeducator certificate: Generalist

*Designates a 2025-26 Iowa teacher shortage area

Partnerships

University of Iowa educator preparation program partners with the following:

1. K-12 school districts
2. Grant Wood AEA, Keystone AEA, Mississippi Bend AEA
3. Neighborhood Centers of Johnson County
4. Kirkwood Community College, Eastern Iowa Community College
5. Iowa Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities

Program Initiatives

University of Iowa initiatives reported from the 2025 Annual Report:

Teacher Education Program Initiatives:

1. GYO Pathway Development: Partnered with four local school districts to create a pathway for paraeducators to earn teacher licensure, particularly in special education.
2. Deans for Impact Involvement: associate dean prioritized GYO initiatives through engagement with deans for impact.
3. Department of Education Teacher Quality Program Grant:
 4. Secured a five-year grant (now terminated) to help K-12 partners develop programming for high school students interested in teaching.
 5. Over 80 high school students participated in young educator programs.
 6. More than 100 students attended the Educators Rising Conference on campus.
7. Connecting K-12 and Higher Education Conference: Brought together stakeholders from higher education and K-12 to discuss instructional practices and collaboration.
8. Community College Partnerships: Ongoing collaboration with Kirkwood Community College, Eastern Iowa Community College and other community colleges to provide flexible TEP routes.
9. Inter-Institutional Collaboration: Continued partnerships with UNI, ISU and active participation in IACTE.

Administrator Preparation Initiatives

- Rural District Leadership Pipeline: Developing a program linking rural districts to support future leaders:
 1. Districts will identify a future leader.
 2. The program will provide cohort-based support, seminars and collaboration opportunities.

Professional School Counselor Preparation Initiatives

1. Integration of School Counseling Framework:
 1. Incorporated into CSED:5230 to guide students in creating comprehensive counseling programs.
 2. Program development starts in CSED:5204 and concludes in CSED:5230.
2. Site Supervisor Professional Development Series:
 1. Piloting webinars on key school counseling topics (for example, ethics, multi-tiered systems of support, suicide prevention, professional advocacy).
 2. Targeting current site supervisors and potentially administrators.
3. Grant-Based Support for School Mental Health Providers
4. Multidisciplinary pathways to recruit, train and retain school mental health providers in Iowa (MPath) Grant Participation:
 1. Aims to address shortages in high-need schools and increase representation from underrepresented groups.
 2. Provides funding support to students entering the program.

Program Trends

A series of tables below provides an overview of program trends.

Program Enrollment

Table 1: University of Iowa Education Enrollment

Semester	# FTE Candidates	# Graduates
Fall 2023	661	253
Fall 2022	832	262
Fall 2021	878	231
Fall 2020	816	223
Fall 2019	731	192

Source: Title II Reports

Program Completers

Table 2: University of Iowa Teacher Program Completers

Academic Year	Elementary Only	Secondary Only	Combined K-6 and 7-12	Total
2023-24	117	99	40	256
2022-23	152	87	23	262
2021-22	116	81	27	224
2020-21	129	66	29	224
2019-20	108	66	23	197

Source: Annual Reports

Table 3: University of Iowa Administrator Program Completers

Academic Year	Principal	Superintendent	Total
2023-24	14	4	18
2022-23	10	4	14
2021-22	8	1	9
2020-21	6	2	8
2019-20	9	3	12

Source: Annual Reports

Table 4: University of Iowa Professional School Counseling Program Completers

Academic Year	Counseling
2023-24	11
2022-23	9
2021-22	14
2020-21	10
2019-20	13

Source: Annual Reports

Table 5: University of Iowa School Psychology Program Completers

Academic Year	School Psychology
2023-24	1
2022-23	0
2021-22	0
2020-21	0
2019-20	0

Source: Annual Reports

Table 6: University of Iowa Speech Language Pathologist Program Completers

Academic Year	Speech Language Pathology
2023-24	0
2022-23	0
2021-22	1
2020-21	1
2019-20	0

Source: Annual Reports

Table 7: University of Iowa School Audiologist Program Completers

Academic Year	School Audiologist
2023-24	0
2022-23	0
2021-22	0
2020-21	0
2019-20	0

Source: Annual Reports

Table 8: University of Iowa School Social Worker Program Completers

Academic Year	School Social Worker
2023-24	0
2022-23	10
2021-22	10
2020-21	4
2019-20	2

Source: Annual Reports

Placement Rates

Table 9: University of Iowa Teacher Placement Rates

Academic Year	# Graduates	# Teaching Jobs	# Grad School
2023-24	252	118	18
2022-23	262	118	4
2021-22	224	116	5
2020-21	224	138	11
2019-20	197	119	4

Source: Annual Reports

Table 10: University of Iowa Administrator Placement Rates

Academic Year	# Graduates	# Administrator Jobs	# Grad School	# Other Area in Education
2023-24	18	9	-	-
2022-23	14	12	0	1
2021-22	9	8	-	-
2020-21	8	4	-	4
2019-20	14	4	-	10

Source: Annual Reports

Table 11: University of Iowa Other Placement Rates

Academic Year	# Graduates	# Jobs	# Grad School	# Other Area in Education
2023-24	13	13	0	0
2022-23	19	13	2	1
2021-22	33	22	-	-
2020-21	15	14	-	1
2019-20	17	13	2	1

Source: Annual Reports

Clinical Faculty, Adjunct and Cooperating Teacher Totals

Table 12: University of Iowa Clinical Faculty, Adjuncts and Cooperating Teachers

Academic Year	# FT Faculty	# Adjunct Faculty	# Cooperating Teachers	# Candidates in Supervised Clinical Experience
2023-24	14	69	332	256
2022-23	13	98	332	262
2021-22	16	73	479	381
2020-21	16	58	291	233
2019-20	12	52	242	210

Source: Title II Reports

Program Review Fast Facts

Duration

Self-Study Review Meeting:	November 1, 2022
Cohort Meetings:	October 6, 2021–January 17, 2024
Institutional Report Received:	December 3, 2024
Preliminary Review:	December 19, 2024
Program Response Received:	February 28, 2025–March 12, 2025
Site Visit:	April 6, 2025–April 9, 2025
Out Brief to Program:	April 9, 2025
Draft Final Report:	July 9, 2025
State Board:	June 18, 2026

Review Team

Five Department program consultants and faculty from Iowa educator preparation programs.

Twelve on-site volunteers and 10 state panel members representing the following institutions:

Iowa State University, University of Dubuque, St. Ambrose University, Upper Iowa University, University of Northern Iowa, Loras College, Luther College, Drake University, Northwestern College, William Penn University, Buena Vista University

Stakeholder Input

Surveys:	Ten to twelve questions per survey Includes short response, Likert scale and open-ended questions
Responses:	Two hundred and eighty-one responses from the following stakeholders: Teacher Preparation: Advisory committee (11), adjuncts (4), alumni (106), candidates (20), cooperating teachers (54), content area faculty (7) Administrator Preparation: Advisory committee (5), adjuncts (5), alumni (6), candidates (4), supervisors/mentors (1) Other School Preparation: Advisory committee (13), adjuncts (2), alumni (13), candidates (6), supervisors/mentors (24)
Interviews:	Fifty-eight interviews held with university administration, program leadership, faculty, staff, students, alumni and stakeholders
Class Interviews:	EDTL:3190 Orientation to Elementary Education EDTL:3127 Methods: Physical Education, Health and Wellness EDTL:4900 Foundations of Special Education EDTL:3091 Secondary Education Orientation & Classroom Management EDTL:3164 Intermediate Reading & Language Arts Methods, 3-6 EDTL:4087 Seminar Curriculum and Student Teaching: Science and Math EDTL:4180 Human Relations for the Classroom Teacher EDTL:3393 Reading & Teaching Adolescent Literature

EDTL:4417 Learning to Teach Second Languages II
EDTL:3163 Methods: Elementary School Mathematics
Introduction to Group Counseling
Consultation Theory and Practice

Continuous Improvement Findings/Concerns

Previous site visit concerns (2017-18) and correlations with the recent visit (2024-25)

Governance Findings/Concerns

2017-18 Site Visit Concerns

79.10(5) Members of the advisory board for educational leadership programs reported being solicited for only one advisory board discussion in the last year. The requirement is that advisory committees are solicited twice each year. The team requires the unit to document policy for soliciting information from the educational leadership advisory board at least twice each year.

79.10(7)d The team finds evidence in the educational leadership program that one clinical faculty member oversees supervising 32 principal and superintendent candidates in clinical experiences across the state. The team is concerned that one position cannot provide quality supervision (for example, observation, support, feedback) for such significant number of candidates. The team requires the unit to examine roles and capacity for supervision and make adjustments to provide quality clinical experiences.

2024-25 Site Visit Correlation

None.

Diversity Findings/Concerns

2017-18 Site Visit Concerns

None.

Faculty Findings/Concerns

2017-18 Site Visit Concerns

79.12(2) The team does not find documented evidence of verification of the alignment of teaching duties for some faculty members. The team requires the unit to examine faculty qualifications and teaching assignments and make adjustments to resolve concerns. The list of faculty members was provided to the unit.

79.12(5)c The team does not find documented evidence related to several faculty members maintaining recent and ongoing collaboration and involvement with colleagues in PK-12 schools, agencies and learning settings. For those faculty members engaged in teacher preparation, activities shall include at least 40 hours of teaching at the appropriate grade level(s) during a period not exceeding five years in duration. The team provided a list of faculty members to the unit.

2024-25 Site Visit Correlation

The program had two correlated concerns identified from the previous visit and the current review related to standards 79.12(1) and 79.12(5). Regarding standard 79.12(1), the program provided additional information clarifying the level of teaching responsibilities assigned to faculty members,

which addressed all but one faculty qualification concern and demonstrated compliance. The remaining faculty member whose qualifications were not appropriately aligned is no longer being utilized by the program. Additionally, the program has implemented systems and review processes to ensure appropriate faculty assignment alignment moving forward and to prevent future misalignment concerns.

For the correlated concern related to standard 79.12(5), the program explained that the relevant policy had been updated after submission of the institutional report. The program demonstrated that moving forward, a process including secure documentation and review procedures is in place to ensure ongoing compliance with faculty collaboration and PK-12 engagement requirements.

Assessment Findings/Concerns

2017-18 Site Visit Concerns

79.13(2) TEP: The unit has developed goals and a plan for moving ahead with this comprehensive assessment system based on InTASC standards. It is not clear if a written plan documenting the necessary action steps and dates have been determined. The team requires unit to document policies, standards alignment, action steps and timelines for implementation.

79.13(5)a TEP: Other than the use of the edTPA as the summative assessment, the team did not find evidence of how the program determines if their assessment measures/tools are fair, reliable and valid. The team requires the unit to develop and implement methods of determining all assessment measures are valid, fair and reliable.

79.13(5)b TEP: The team does not find evidence of how candidates are assessed on their progression on unit standards. There is no evidence to indicate candidate completion of signature assignments show evidence of attainment of the standards. Faculty and candidates equate passing a course and uploading signature assignments as meeting standards. The team requires the unit to develop a system that more clearly allows candidates to demonstrate attainment of unit standards.

79.13(5), 79.13(6), 79.13(8) Educational Leadership. The team did not find evidence the leadership preparation program is conducting candidate and program assessment in accordance with standards. The following citations articulate this concern.

A. 79.13(5)a Educational leadership. The team did not find evidence of how the program determines if the measures/tools they use are fair, reliable and valid. The team requires the unit to develop and implement methods of determining all assessment measures are valid, fair and reliable.

B. 79.13(5)c Educational leadership. The team does not find evidence the program uses multiple measures to assess the candidate on each standard. The team requires the unit to implement multiple measures to assess candidates on each standard.

C. 79.13(5)d Educational leadership. There is no evidence the standards are addressed to show candidate progress on the standards at different developmental levels throughout the duration of the program. The team requires the unit to implement assessments to evaluate candidate progress at different developmental levels in the program.

D. 79.13(6)a Educational leadership. The team did not find evidence that individual assessment data on unit standards is analyzed. The team requires the unit to implement policy for analyzing assessment data for program assessment.

E. 79.13(6)c Educational leadership. The team did not find evidence of how the program is aggregating and using performance data to guide program improvements. The evaluations used for program assessments currently are perception based (alumni and course evaluation surveys). The

team requires the unit to implement policy for aggregating and using candidate performance data for programmatic decisions.

F. 79.13(8) Educational leadership. The team does not find evidence that the unit regularly reviews, evaluates and revises the assessment system. The team requires the unit to implement policy for regularly reviewing and revising the assessment system.

2024-25 Site Visit Correlation

Both reviews identified inconsistencies in assessment practices, including the need for clearer systems for candidate and program evaluation for the administrator and other programs.

In response to the current concern, the unit described several actions intended to strengthen assessment practices across administrator and professional preparation programs, including the implementation of EPP Sessions focused on assessment systems, workshops on standardization and interrater reliability led by the director of assessment and continuous improvement, enhancements to the Tk20 assessment system, development of common rubrics, expanded data access and review processes. These efforts demonstrate the unit's recognition of the previously identified concerns and the establishment of more systematic structures to support consistency, reliability and continuous improvement across all educator preparation programs.

Teacher Clinical Findings/Concerns

2017-18 Site Visit Concerns

79.14(6) The team finds inconsistencies for secondary teacher education students in the number and quality of practicum opportunities prior to student teaching. Some programs offer multiple opportunities while others may only offer one without a requirement to interact with students. The team requires the unit to evaluate the secondary education program to develop and implement policy to ensure equity in opportunity and quality of clinical experiences.

79.14(7e) The team does not find evidence that the mock evaluation was taking place during the student teaching experience. The team requires the unit to develop and implement policy to ensure mock evaluations takes place and are useful.

79.14(8) The team finds concern with the duration, content and attendance of the workshop for cooperating teachers. The team requires the unit to develop and implement policy to ensure the cooperating teacher workshop is used to meet the needs of cooperating teachers and the program.

2024-25 Site Visit Correlation

None.

Teacher Education Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Findings/Concerns

2017-18 Site Visit Concerns

None.

Administrator Clinical Findings/Concerns

2017-18 Site Visit Concerns

None.

Administrator Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Findings/Concerns

2017-18 Site Visit Concerns

None.

School Psychology Clinical Practice Standard Findings/Concerns

2017-18 Site Visit Concerns

None.

School Psychology Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Standard Findings/Concerns

2017-18 Site Visit Concerns

None.

School Social Work Clinical Practice Standard Findings/Concerns

2017-18 Site Visit Concerns

None.

School Social Work Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Standard Findings/Concerns

2017-18 Site Visit Concerns

None.

Speech Language Pathology Clinical Practice Standard Findings/Concerns

2017-18 Site Visit Concerns

None.

Speech Language Pathology Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Standard Findings/Concerns

2017-18 Site Visit Concerns

None.

Professional School Counseling Clinical Practice Standard Findings/Concerns

2017-18 Site Visit Concerns

None.

Professional School Counseling Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Standard Findings/Concerns

2017-18 Site Visit Concerns

None.

School Audiologist Studies Clinical Practice Standard Findings/Concerns

2017-18 Site Visit Concerns

None.

School Audiologist Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Standard Findings/Concerns

2017-18 Site Visit Concerns

None.

Full Initial Site Visit Report with Institution Responses

University of Iowa

Team Report

Preliminary Review: December 19, 2024

Site Visit: April 6, 2025 through April 9, 2025

Final Report: May 1, 2025

Presented to the State Board of Education on: June 18, 2026

Iowa Department of Education

Site Visit Team Members:

Maryam Rod Szabo, Iowa Department of Education
Stephanie TeKippe, Iowa Department of Education
Erica Woods-Schmitz, Iowa Department of Education
Lindsay Harrison, Iowa Department of Education
Amy Mayer, Iowa Department of Education
Dana Oswald, William Penn University
Angela Rekers, St. Ambrose University
Tanya Volkova, St. Ambrose University
Alex Hansen, Upper Iowa University
Jaime Boeckman, Iowa State University
Hilarie Welsh, Loras College
Lisa Chizek, Iowa State University
Scott Scheuerell, Loras College
Tim Gilson, University of Northern Iowa
Elliott Johnson, Luther College
Bengu Erguner-Tekinalp, Drake University
Missy Springsteen Haupt, Iowa State University
Jeffrey Haverland, University of Dubuque
Larry Bice, Iowa State University
Chad Biermeier, University of Dubuque
Joel Carter, Emmaus Bible College
Benjamin Forsyth, University of Northern Iowa
Brittany Garling, Buena Vista University
Linda Lind, Iowa State University
Dana Oswald, William Penn University
Michele Swanson, University of Northern Iowa
Carrie Thonstad, Northwestern College

Acknowledgements

Team members would like to express their gratitude to the University of Iowa community for their hospitality and assistance in facilitating the team's work. The tasks associated with the review process necessitate intense focus by reviewers during a concentrated period. Everyone we encountered

graciously responded to our questions and requests for materials. We interacted with a wide variety of individuals who demonstrated enthusiasm, professionalism and dedication to this program.

The team expresses its appreciation for the work of all involved with a special thank you to those whose roles were integral in the success of this visit, particularly Mark McDermott, associate dean of the college of education; Dave Tingwald, licensure and standards coordinator; and Betsy Justis, educational licensure specialist.

GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES STANDARD

281—79.10(256) *Governance and resources standard. Governance and resources adequately support the preparation of practitioner candidates to meet professional, state and institutional standards in accordance with the following provisions.*

79.10(1) *A clearly understood governance structure provides guidance and support for all educator preparation programs in the unit.*

79.10(2) *The professional education unit has primary responsibility for all educator preparation programs offered by the institution through any delivery model.*

79.10(3) *The unit's conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for the unit and provides the foundation for all components of the educator preparation programs.*

79.10(4) *The unit demonstrates alignment of unit standards with current national professional standards for educator preparation. Teacher preparation must align with InTASC standards. Leadership preparation programs must align with NELP standards.*

79.10(5) *The unit provides evidence of ongoing collaboration with appropriate stakeholders. There is an active advisory committee that is involved semiannually in providing input for program evaluation and continuous improvement.*

79.10(6) *When a unit is a part of a college or university, there is ongoing collaboration with the appropriate departments of the institution, especially regarding content knowledge.*

79.10(7) *The institution provides resources and support necessary for the delivery of quality preparation program(s). The resources and support include the following:*

a. Financial resources; facilities; appropriate educational materials, equipment and library services; and commitment to a work climate, policies, and faculty/staff assignments which promote/support best practices in teaching, scholarship and service;

b. Resources to support professional development opportunities;

c. Resources to support technological and instructional needs to enhance candidate learning;

d. Resources to support quality clinical experiences for all educator candidates; and

e. Commitment of sufficient administrative, clerical, and technical staff.

79.10(8) *The unit has a clearly articulated appeals process, aligned with the institutional policy, for decisions impacting candidates. This process is communicated to all candidates and faculty.*

79.10(9) *The use of part-time faculty and graduate students in teaching roles is purposeful and is managed to ensure integrity, quality, and continuity of all programs.*

79.10(10) *Resources are equitable for all program components, regardless of delivery model or location.*

Initial Team Findings - Governance and Resources

Commendations/Strengths

- The team commends the innovative approach of enhancing communication and training through implementation of a video channel and a high level of support from the technology personnel for resources and training provided regularly and when requested.
- The educational leadership program demonstrates strong and consistent collaboration with its advisory committee through leadership's personal and responsive approach, evidenced by high attendance and active participation supporting continuous program improvement.
- The unit demonstrates a strong commitment to excellence by going beyond compliance through the intentional development, alignment and integration of the unit's core principles across all programs. This collaborative effort reflects a deep, program-wide dedication to embedding these principles in meaningful and purposeful ways.

Recommendations

1. 79.10(6)f The team found evidence, through student and faculty interviews, of inconsistency within educational leadership courses and assessment management systems. For example, a student commented, "If there could be some consistency across the faculty in how they use Canvas and Iowa Courses Online to deliver content, that would be much appreciated." The team recommends the unit consider available resources, such as an instructional designer, to unify student learning experiences.

Unit Response. Thank you for the helpful recommendation. The EPLS faculty have established a goal of implementing a consistent course template for fall 2026 and future course offerings. The faculty have begun work with instructional designers in the University of Iowa's Division of Distance and Online Education. As a first step, the director of instructional design was invited to a department faculty meeting to discuss development of a consistent course template, which the educational leadership faculty plans to use for all courses of the principal and superintendent programs. In addition, a departmental committee has been established to explore template models and to gather feedback from faculty, with the intent to identify design elements and needs for the program's courses.

2. 79.10(4) While teacher education, educational leadership and school counseling programs have functioning advisory committees or boards, the unit identified, through the self-study process, the absence of a formal advisory structure for school psychology, school audiologist, school speech-language pathologist and school social work programs. Advisory committee meetings were held and documented starting in the spring of 2025. The team recommends the unit continue holding and documenting semiannual meetings with the Professional Service Advisory Committee. Documentation will be reviewed at the one-year follow-up visit.

Unit Response. The unit will continue the Professional Service Advisory Committee. The committee will meet a minimum of twice each academic year. In addition to providing a forum for information-sharing and receiving input from external stakeholders, we anticipate asking the committee to undertake collaborative projects in delivery and assessment of the professional service programs. Initially, the school counseling program was not included in this committee because the school counseling program is served by a departmental advisory committee; it is planned that the school counseling program will be included in future meetings of the committee, so that the committee can serve as a forum for collaboration on common needs of the professional service programs.

3. 79.10(6)a Based on the institutional report and leadership interviews, the team found that a low percentage of courses in the teaching and learning program are taught by full-time faculty. Given the

increase in student enrollment, the team recommends hiring additional visiting faculty to ensure more consistent instructional coverage than is currently provided by part-time faculty and teaching assistants.

Unit Response. This recommendation has been communicated to the dean of the CoE. Each year, the department executive officer (DEO) of each of the CoE's four academic departments, of which teaching and learning is one, make requests for staffing. These requests are reviewed by the CoE's director of finance and budget operations, as well as by the Dean. Hiring decisions, including the level and rank of new positions, are determined on a yearly basis. Considerations in making these decisions include the overall enrollment, the need for staffing in the Office of Student Services and other support positions and other college needs. The request for additional visiting or permanent faculty is reiterated each year. The CoE is making enhancements to its practices for onboarding of adjunct instructors, with the goal of preparing them for their instructional and student support duties. A summary of adjunct instructor onboarding practices and a handout with information for new adjunct instructors was provided to the review team.

4. 79.10(6)a, g The team found evidence, through interviews, job descriptions and the institutional report, that course supervisors are utilized to enhance the integrity and quality of instruction delivered by part-time and graduate student instructors. The team recommends the unit implement a formal, systematic process to ensure regular teaching evaluations that support and promote best practices in instruction. Additionally, the team recommends that associate department executive officers be granted access to student perception of teaching survey reports to aid in the evaluation of part-time faculty and teaching assistants.

Unit Response. The CoE is making enhancements to its practices for onboarding of adjunct instructors. The enhancements are intended to standardize preparation of new and continuing instructors, clarify their professional development opportunities and the structure for evaluation and formative feedback and to guide the course supervisors who are charged with providing evaluation and support to the adjunct instructors. A summary of adjunct instructor onboarding practices has been provided to the review team. Access to the course feedback gathered through the Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPOT) surveys is determined at the university level, not at the level of the college. Requests to provide access to the SPOT survey data to additional departmental administrators has been made by several of the University of Iowa's colleges.

5. 79.10(1) The team found evidence of collaboration and communication across programs; however, there is a lack of cohesive oversight of key functions (governance, assessment, clinical evaluation and record keeping) in the professional school counseling, school psychology, speech-language pathology and school audiology programs. The team recommends the unit clearly define the responsibilities of program coordinators tasked with ensuring compliance in educator preparation programs and assess the time and resources needed to meet expectations.

Unit Response. Within the CoE there is an ongoing effort by a team of faculty and administrators to clarify the roles and responsibilities of program coordinators and to document those responsibilities as they relate both to programs in educator preparation and programs outside of educator preparation. The CoE's Associate dean for faculty and graduate education are guiding this effort. Included in the team is the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education and Educator Preparation, who oversees the educator preparation unit. In the context of this effort, the Associate dean for undergraduate education and educator preparation will seek to integrate into the team's work the responsibilities of program coordinators that relate to licensure requirements and to compliance with the Chapter 79 educator preparation standards; incorporate the unit's existing compliance processes; and extend and apply this work to the professional service license programs.

Findings/Concerns

1. 79.10(2) The administrator preparation program recognizes that its conceptual framework needs to be updated to reflect current best practices and has communicated plans to begin revisions in summer 2025. The team requires the program to submit a detailed revision plan that includes a timeline, key milestones and steps for updating the conceptual framework.

Unit Response. Educational leadership faculty will meet monthly during the 2025-2026 academic year to review literature that will inform and guide the development of a new program framework. The faculty will be assigned readings to discuss and synthesize during each monthly meeting. The team has begun drafting a conceptual framework. The educational leadership faculty will focus on four foundations to guide the development of the conceptual framework. The four foundations are: 1) Leadership for Learning; 2) Developing Meaningful Collaboration; 3) Producing Reflective Educators; and 4) Leading Improvement and Change. The review team was provided with a working draft of the conceptual framework, timeline and action steps.

2. 79.10(3) Through the review of syllabi, the team did not find evidence that the dyslexia specialist Endorsement is aligned to the national dyslexia professional standards. The program is required to provide a crosswalk and detailed syllabi including where IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards (KPS) are addressed through the different courses.

Unit Response. The review team was provided with a new, revised curriculum exhibit, with course syllabi that show alignment to the IDA KPS and a crosswalk that shows the alignment of the course concepts to the individual IDA standards. The curriculum exhibit, syllabi and crosswalk represent the original course structure of the University of Iowa's dyslexia specialist program, as it had been submitted and approved by the Iowa Reading Research Center (IRRC), the Department and Board of Educational Examiners (BoEE) and as it had been offered beginning in the fall 2021 semester. The crosswalk was created by an IRRC graduate assistant who was tasked with verifying the alignment of the courses within the revised curriculum exhibit with the IDA KPS.

Department Response. The team did not find evidence of IEP and 504 content, practice, application or assessment in the curriculum. The unit is required to update and resubmit relevant syllabi. The team did not find evidence that a faculty member has K-12 teaching experience and therefore is not qualified to provide instruction including teaching methods or strategies for the dyslexia endorsement. The unit is responsible to align teaching experience, education and expertise appropriately with teaching assignments.

From the review, several recommendations arose, including: (1) the team highly recommends adding EDTL:6171 as a prerequisite for EDTL:6172 to ensure candidates learn and engage with assessment practices related to dyslexia prior to the clinical portion in EDTL:6172 as the culmination of the endorsement; (2) the team highly recommends that a specific faculty teaches the EDTL:6171 course due to her background and experience to assist in the depth of literacy assessment knowledge needed to prepare candidates in this area; and (3) the team recommends that a specific faculty member engage in K-12 literacy, dyslexia professional development as the majority of her experience, research and professional development is centered on the behavioral side of special education.

Unit Response. Thank you for the recommendation. Revised syllabi for EDTL:6171 and EDTL:6172 have been included and incorporate these suggestions. IEP and 504 plan content has been integrated throughout EDTL:6171. Four new course objectives were added covering translation of assessment findings into IEP-appropriate language (for example, measurable goals, present levels, specially designed instruction), design of 504 accommodations, understanding of legal frameworks (IDEA and Section 504) and participation in IEP meetings. All four assessment reports now require IEP-aligned recommendations and 504 accommodations where applicable. IEP/504 topics also appear in most

class sessions. The specific faculty member has been designated as the course instructor for EDTL:6172. Students will be asked to complete EDTL:6171 prior to completing EDTL:6172.

3. 79.10(5) Evidence, through the institutional report, faculty interviews and survey responses, indicates a lack of intentional, ongoing collaboration with content faculty, particularly in the CLAS and the special education program. The team requires the unit to develop and implement a plan for sustained, purposeful collaboration with faculty in these areas.

Unit Response. Faculty in the CLAS provide courses and majors that contribute some or all content knowledge for most University of Iowa teacher candidates. Therefore, our primary goals in collaboration with CLAS faculty are to share information about state requirements as they relate to the content our teacher candidates will teach, learn about planned changes in CLAS course or major offerings and have discussion about opportunities for innovative instructional practices. The Associate dean for undergraduate education and educator preparation is co-leader of a university group focused on bringing together K-12 and higher education faculty, in all content areas, to collaborate in development of effective learning environments. This group holds an annual conference each April and members recently collaborated to submit a proposal for a presentation at a national conference. This university group has a focus on practical change in encouraging collaboration across colleges of the University of Iowa.

Special Education. Special education is a program area within the CoE's Department of Teaching and Learning, which is the department that houses most of the faculty who provide instruction in the TEP. The special education faculty attend all departmental and college-wide meetings along with other TEP faculty. Special education faculty contribute to the governance of the TEP generally, as well as of the other TEP program areas. Some individual members of the special education program faculty participate as co-leaders of the elementary education program, and others serve as members of the Secondary Program Area Board (advisory to the associate dean) and the Department of Teaching and Learning Curriculum Council (advisory to the departmental executive officer).

The Associate dean for undergraduate education and educator preparation has instituted a series of individual meetings with all TEP faculty members, including special education faculty, to better understand perspectives and develop insight into ways to integrate work and expertise across our program. Special education faculty are being integrated into ongoing efforts to improve and enhance literacy instruction. Opportunities are being explored for collaborative teaching between special education faculty and faculty in other program areas, to meaningfully provide all teacher candidates with methods instruction in working with students with disabilities.

The TEP faculty is large and efforts are being consistently made to assure that all perspectives are being acknowledged, the opinions of all stakeholders are being recognized and the expertise of all faculty from all content areas is being reflected in all decision-making. These activities are in furtherance of the values articulated in the CoE's Strategic Plan, especially Foster Belonging. That is, the college seeks to develop an overall culture of belonging.

4. 79.10(10) The team found evidence, through interviews, of varying experiences in the online foundations of the special education course compared to the in-person section. Candidates expressed dissatisfaction in the online offering and indicated a preference for the in-person section. However, lack of space for in-person offerings was communicated as a barrier, leading to enrollment later in the course progression or enrolling in the online course regardless of candidates' perceived difference of quality. The unit is required to review, update and ensure similar experiences regardless of the delivery method and evaluate the need for offering more in-person sections.

Unit Response. In response to the concerns raised by the review team, the faculty of the special education program are making two changes relating to EDTL:4900 Foundations of Special Education, with the intention of increasing the quality of the course, better aligning the online and face-to-face

offerings and as a result raising student satisfaction. The course itself is being revised and the number of seats in future course offerings will be increased. Beginning in summer 2025, the faculty of the special education program initiated a refresh of the EDTL:4900 course, with the assistance of instructional design personnel from the university's Division of Distance and Online Education. A team of the faculty, led by one of the current instructors and anticipated coordinator of online sections, restructured course assignments and requirements. The team, all content experts in special education, established an alignment of quizzes and assignments with the new course text and expanded the role of weekly assessments for each week's course module. Additionally, each module has been supplemented with lecture recordings by special education faculty, in their areas of expertise. The first offering of the revised course will be in the winter 2025 session. The review team has been provided with a revised syllabus of EDTL:4900. In addition, the special education program faculty intend to offer additional seats in the face-to-face sections of EDTL:4900, beginning with the spring 2026 semester. In past semesters, it has been typical for face-to-face offerings of EDTL:4900 to have open seats; it is hoped that the increase of face-to-face seats will allow individual students to have the choice whether to enroll in the online or the face-to-face offerings.

Sources of Information

Interviews with: Dean, associate provost, associate dean for undergraduate education and educator preparation, academic department executive officers, director for assessment and continuous improvement, faculty, adjuncts, candidates, associate vice president of operations and decision support, CoE director of finance and budget, elementary and secondary program leads, advising and student support, curriculum council, secondary education program board

Review of: Institutional report, program response to the preliminary review, surveys, course syllabi, handbooks, program opening presentation, assessment system overview

DIVERSITY STANDARD

281—79.11(256) Diversity standard. *The environment and experiences provided for practitioner candidates support candidate growth in knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn in accordance with the following provisions.*

79.11(1) *The institution and unit work to establish a climate that promotes and supports diversity.*

79.11(2) *The institution's and unit's plans, policies, and practices document their efforts in establishing and maintaining a diverse faculty and student body.*

Initial Team Findings - Diversity

Commendations/Strengths

- The team commends the unit for its intentional and purposeful faculty hiring practices. Interviews confirmed that new hires are selected based on their expertise, passion and commitment to fostering a supportive environment and maintaining a faculty with varied backgrounds and perspectives.
- Interviews with the university president, administration, faculty and students highlighted the importance of exposure to diversity of thought that fosters an intellectual environment for cognitive growth within the unit and university.

Recommendations

1. 79.11(2) The team found evidence that the educational leadership program has shown a strong commitment to diversity by launching a rural administrator preparation initiative. This includes partnering with rural districts to identify needs and provide targeted support. To enhance its impact, the team recommends the unit collaborate with university leadership to explore recruitment strategies to further strengthen the pipeline of rural administrators.

Unit Response. The DEO of EPLS, with the educational leadership program's faculty, will explore the possibility of participating in the Department's GYO principal preparation pathway. The program faculty and departmental administrative have a strong interest to learn about this program and how to incorporate it into the existing offerings of the department and program. During the current 2025-2026 academic year, the faculty coordinator of the educational leadership program will contact the Department to schedule a meeting to discuss the pathway. If the program is determined to be a viable option for the university, the educational leadership program faculty would seek to identify three to five rural school districts as prospective partners in the program.

2. 79.11(1) Several graduate programs, including professional school counseling, require candidates to attend full-time. While this supports focused clinical experiences in high-quality settings, it limits access for working school professionals who cannot commit to full-time study. The site visit team recommends the programs explore flexible options to expand access for candidates across Iowa.

Unit Response. Thank you for the recommendation. School counseling candidates do have the option to go part-time and extend their program of study beyond the typical two-year plan. Prospective school counseling candidates are advised of this option in the context of the interview day that forms part of the admission process and current school counseling candidates are reminded of this option in the context of their semester advising appointments. Candidates can revise their programs of study in consultation with their faculty advisors.

Findings/Concerns

None.

Sources of Information

Interviews with: President, dean, graduate college dean, associate dean for undergraduate education and educator preparation, academic department executive officers, director for assessment and continuous improvement, faculty, adjuncts, advising and student support, curriculum council, director of the baker teacher leader center, recruitment coordinator, application developer

Review of: Institutional report, program response to the preliminary review, student records, program opening presentation

FACULTY STANDARD

281—79.12(256) Faculty standard. Faculty qualifications and performance shall facilitate the professional development of practitioner candidates in accordance with the following provisions.

79.12(1) The unit defines the roles and requirements for faculty members by position. The unit describes how roles and requirements are determined.

79.12(2) The unit documents the alignment of teaching duties for each faculty member with that member's preparation, knowledge, experiences and skills.

79.12(3) The unit holds faculty members accountable for teaching prowess. This accountability includes evaluation and indicators for continuous improvement.

79.12(4) The unit holds faculty members accountable for professional growth to meet the academic needs of the unit.

79.12(5) Faculty members collaborate with:

- a. Colleagues in the unit;
- b. Colleagues across the institution;
- c. Colleagues in PK-12 schools/agencies/learning settings. Faculty members engage in professional education and maintain ongoing involvement in activities in preschool and elementary, middle, or secondary schools. For faculty members engaged in teacher preparation, activities shall include at least 40 hours of teaching at the appropriate grade level(s) during a period not exceeding five years in duration.

Initial Team Findings - Faculty

Commendations/Strengths

- The team commends the leadership of Mark McDermott for creating a supportive environment for faculty and responding to expressed needs. Several noteworthy actions include creating a position focused on student support, providing weekly lunch meetings for new faculty and providing ongoing opportunities for professional development.
- The unit demonstrates a strong commitment to faculty development by offering multiple, well-supported pathways for professional growth. These opportunities, particularly for instructor advancement, reflect a strategic investment in instructional excellence and long-term program quality.
- Candidates value and appreciate faculty expertise in their subject matter; the quality and depth of feedback provided; and a continual willingness to be available, responsive and flexible to meet a variety of candidate needs.

Recommendation

1. 79.12(1) The team found evidence, through the institutional report, opening presentation and interviews, that while the educational leadership and TEPs provide onboarding and consistent communication for adjunct faculty, the process is not formalized. To ensure consistency and clarity, the team recommends the unit develop a standardized onboarding process, for all programs, to utilize with new part-time faculty.

Unit Response. The Associate dean for undergraduate education and educator preparation will be providing to departmental administrators a summary of unit expectations for onboarding of adjunct instructors in the educator preparation programs, with specific requirements for the departments that are carrying out the onboarding. A summary of adjunct instructor onboarding practices has been provided to the review team. In addition, adjunct faculty, the same as other categories of faculty, are invited to training and information presentations along with other faculty. Video recordings are made of these presentations and are available for viewing online.

Findings/Concerns

1. 79.12(2) The team was unable to confirm alignment of teaching duties with the faculty's preparation, knowledge, experiences and skills for several faculty members following a review of the institutional report, curriculum vitae and resumes. The unit is required to provide curriculum vitae or resumes for the documented faculty.

In addition, the team requires the unit to develop a plan for the following faculty members to acquire appropriate experiences to continue teaching responsibilities in the designated content area and level for the documented faculty.

Unit Response. Thank you for making us aware of the concerns. We have provided curriculum vitae for the set of identified instructors. These instructors are graduate students who serve as primary instructor, team teacher or field experience supervisor for a course or course(s) of the TEP, for whom documentation of preparation, knowledge, experiences and skills was not found at the site visit.

The instructor who lacked experience in elementary-level science, but had preparation and experience in secondary science, remains a graduate teaching assistant in the TEP. The science education program has taken note of the misalignment of duties for this instructor and this instructor no longer provides instruction for elementary science methods courses. This instructor's teaching duties in the fall 2025 and spring 2026 academic year are for courses classified by the unit as pedagogy and content that are intended for teacher candidates in middle grades and high school science.

We understand from follow-up communications, from the review team, that those of the graduate students who continue to provide instruction are qualified for their roles.

2. 79.12(2) Through a review of syllabi, faculty curriculum vitae and interviews, the team did not find evidence that specific faculty have the necessary knowledge, preparation and expertise to develop and deliver the dyslexia specialist curriculum, particularly in areas related to the assessment of the cognitive linguistic markers of dyslexia using formal assessment measures. The unit is required to provide detailed faculty qualifications using this table, which is derived from the IRRC application for offering a dyslexia specialist.

Unit Response. The review team has been provided with a table consisting of a summary of University of Iowa faculty qualifications for providing instruction in a dyslexia specialist program.

Department Response. See response to 79.10(3) above.

Unit Response. Special education is an expansive field of study that is not limited to K-12 classroom instruction. In addition to the background and experiences the specific faculty has as a college professor working in special education and works as a research assistant in the IRRC, it is important to note that the four years of experience working with the UI REACH program, a postsecondary program for young adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Duties included (a) designing, differentiating and teaching courses in academic, independent living, social and vocational skills; (b) conducting and analyzing routine academic skill assessments; (c) interviewing and admitting students to the program; (d) assisting students in engaging in campus and community activities; and (e) working with students in the residence hall. He also has extensive work on several grant funded projects listed in the curriculum vitae related to reading development strategies. For the dyslexia specialist endorsement, the primary teaching responsibility is EDTL:7953 Single Subject Research Design, a course that is particularly aligned to the faculty's skills and expertise.

The unit assesses that a specific faculty's knowledge, skills and dispositions are well suited to the role. The faculty earned a graduate certificate in dyslexia in 2022 from a program that is aligned with the IDA's KPS for Teachers of Reading. We believe this, in addition to the significant amount of research and scholarship that is detailed on the curriculum vitae, is strong evidence of the faculty's ability to provide effective instruction in the dyslexia specialist endorsement area. The specific faculty has published about reading intervention and has given presentations at the IRRC Summit. "Behavior" in the faculty's background refers to behavioral psychology and applied behavior analysis, which is generally applied to academic tasks including reading.

3. 79.12(4) The team did not find evidence, through the institutional report, preliminary review responses and provided documents, that the unit collects or tracks information related to faculty's professional growth. The team requires the unit to develop a policy or process to collect evidence (for example, add a professional development component in conjunction with the collection of the 40-hour data) of professional development that aligns with teaching responsibilities that also includes how the unit will regularly collect and document that information.

Unit Response. Each program area within the TEP is required by the Associate dean for undergraduate education and educator preparation to complete a checklist of documents, reports and affirmations (the TEP annual program checklist) relating to several governance and standards compliance needs. The checklist has been updated beginning with the fall 2025 semester to require program areas to report professional development experiences of the program faculty, with verification by the associate dean that these requirements have been fulfilled. The checklist and related materials are provided to faculty through a "team" in Microsoft Teams, which allows not only the faculty, but also administrators and staff with related responsibilities to have access to the materials. The template provided by the unit for faculty use has been updated to include explanatory text about the requirement. In addition, reporting on professional development experiences is being incorporated into the university's web-based professional documentation portal that already is used by faculty to record their ongoing involvement

activities in schools (40-hour requirement). Reporting of data from these submissions is managed by the CoE's director of assessment and continuous improvement. The review team has been provided with the updated checklist and a sample of the template that is provided for programs' use in documenting professional development activities.

4. 79.12(5)c The team found evidence, through preliminary review responses, that several faculty are not in compliance with the 40-hour requirement of teaching or co-teaching every five years. The unit is required to provide evidence of or a plan for completion for specific faculty. Additionally, the team found evidence that two faculty provide primary instruction in teacher education courses and must also meet this requirement. The unit is required to submit a plan outlining how these faculty members will begin fulfilling this expectation.

Unit Response. Regarding the first faculty, unit administrators have worked with the faculty member to develop a plan for compliance. The review team has been provided with documentation of this faculty member's planned future ongoing involvement activities that will bring the faculty into compliance with the unit's policy for the standard.

The second faculty member has served as primary instructor and team teacher of preliminary courses of the elementary education program that are completed prior to admission to the TEP. Because the courses are preliminary to the TEP, they had been outside the definitions used during the self-study process for implementation of the CoE's 40-hour ongoing involvement policy; as a result, documentation for instructors of these courses was not included in self-study or site visit materials. Based on feedback from the review team, the following has been added to the course definitions that are used for implementation of the CoE's policy: "An introductory course that provides foundational information about classroom practice or communicates the conceptual framework of the program (for example, EDTL:2111 Teaching Elementary Learners I)."

The third faculty member served as team teacher of a preliminary course of the elementary education program that is completed prior to TEP admission. Like the courses referenced above, the course had been outside the definitions used for implementation of the 40-hour ongoing involvement policy, but now is included within the definitions. The faculty member is no longer at the University of Iowa.

Having been advised by the review team that this faculty member's role is within the scope of the standard, the unit has provided the review team with documentation of this faculty member's ongoing involvement to date and planned future activities that will bring the instructor into compliance with the unit's policy for the standard.

Sources of Information

Interviews with: Dean, associate dean for undergraduate education and educator preparation, academic department executive officers, director for assessment and continuous improvement, faculty, adjuncts, elementary and secondary program leads, coordinator of student field experiences

Review of: Institutional report, program response to the preliminary review, surveys, course syllabi, handbooks, program opening presentation

ASSESSMENT STANDARD

281—79.13(256) Assessment system and unit evaluation standard. *The unit's assessment system shall appropriately monitor individual candidate performance and use that data in concert with other information to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs in accordance with the following provisions.*

79.13(1) *The unit has a clearly defined, cohesive assessment system.*

79.13(2) *The assessment system is based on unit standards.*

79.13(3) *The assessment system includes both individual candidate assessment and comprehensive unit assessment.*

79.13(4) *Candidate assessment includes clear criteria for:*

a. Entrance into the program. If a unit chooses to use a preprofessional skills test from a nationally recognized testing service for admission into the program, the unit must report passing rates and remediation measures annually to the department.

b. Continuation in the program with clearly defined checkpoints/gates.

c. Admission to clinical experiences.

d. Program completion.

79.13(5) *Individual candidate assessment includes all of the following:*

a. Measures used for candidate assessment are fair, reliable, and valid.

b. Candidates are assessed on their demonstration/attainment of unit standards.

c. Multiple measures are used for assessment of the candidate on each unit standard.

d. Candidates are assessed on unit standards at different developmental stages.

e. Candidates are provided with formative feedback on their progress toward attainment of unit standards.

f. Candidates use the provided formative assessment data to reflect upon and guide their development/growth toward attainment of unit standards.

g. Candidates are assessed at the same level of performance across programs, regardless of the place or manner in which the program is delivered.

79.13(6) *Comprehensive unit assessment includes all of the following:*

a. Individual candidate assessment data on unit standards, as described in subrule 79.13(5), are analyzed.

b. The aggregated assessment data are analyzed to evaluate programs.

c. Findings from the evaluation of aggregated assessment data are used to make program improvements.

d. Evaluation data are shared with stakeholders.

e. The collection, aggregation, analysis, and evaluation of assessment data described in this subrule take place on a regular cycle.

79.13(7) *The unit shall conduct a survey of graduates and their employers to ensure that the graduates are well-prepared, and the data shall be used for program improvement.*

79.13(8) *The unit regularly reviews, evaluates, and revises the assessment system.*

79.13(9) *The unit annually reports to the department such data as is required by the state and federal governments.*

Initial Team Findings – Assessment

Commendations/Strengths

- The team commends the unit for transparent and thorough documentation of program entry, completion and student progress tracking. Clearly identifying the responsible reviewers for each component also promotes effective collaboration in record management.

Recommendations

1. 79.13(1) Following the director of assessment and continuous improvement interview, the team found that while Tk20 currently houses student progress tracking and program-wide assessment data, there is a need to proactively plan for the phase-out of Tk20, as Watermark support is ending. The team recommends the unit develop a transition plan for replacing or rebuilding the data infrastructure currently supported by Tk20.

Unit Response. Tk20 is the assessment system that is in use by the TEP and the educational leadership program (principal and superintendent preparation). The current contract for use of Tk20 expires spring 2027. The Associate dean for undergraduate education and educator preparation has assembled a working group of faculty and staff, including the CoE's director of assessment and continuous improvement, the college's Application Developer and additional individuals to establish a timeline for the evaluation of potential platforms to replace Tk20 alongside the acquisition and implementation of a new system. Under consideration is whether the future assessment platform would be based on a third-party product or programmed in-house at the university. Earliest implementation of a new assessment platform would be fall 2026.

2. 79.13(2) The team found evidence, through student interviews, that candidates are confused between InTASC and the unit's core principles. While the unit appropriately utilizes InTASC standards to guide assessment, the team recommends clearly distinguishing and communicating the differences between the two sets of standards for candidates.

Unit Response. The TEP core principles and the InTASC standards are introduced to students during their first TEP courses. For elementary teacher candidates, that course is either EDTL:2111 Teaching Elementary Learners I or EDTL:2155 Core Principles in Elementary Education. For secondary teacher candidates, the course is EDTL:3091 Secondary Education Orientation and Classroom Management. In each of these courses, teacher candidates are provided a general overview of the conceptual framework (TEP core principles) and the teacher preparation standards (InTASC). The learning materials utilized with these presentations (course materials) are being reviewed to determine how clarity can be gained to help students determine the differences between each set of standards and how they are incorporated in the overall program. Sample course presentation slides were provided to the review team.

3. 79.13(3)a Following interviews with students, the team found that the transfer admission process lacks clarity and consistency. Several candidates reported they were advised of a two-plus-two pathway but ultimately required an additional semester for completion. While faculty support the “new learners” versus “principles tracks” students expressed confusion about messaging and requirements. Additionally, secondary education candidates expressed concerns about uncertainty in the admission process, particularly regarding timing and required components. The team recommends the unit review and improve its transfer admission communication and processes to ensure clear expectations (for example, prerequisites or timelines) and pathways.

Unit Response. Thank you for the recommendation. The staff academic advisors of the TEP work closely with advising staff of several community colleges, particularly with the advising staff of Kirkwood Community College, which is the community college from which we get many of our transfer students, to make sure the advisors are aware of our pathways and can articulate them clearly to all students.

We are developing short informational videos for students on a variety of topics related to the TEP, including navigating admissions, transfer admissions and clarifying timelines and requirements for admissions. In addition, we will continue to review our website ensuring that its content is up-to-date and clear.

4. 79.13(4)d The team found, through interviews and syllabi, that courses in the dyslexia specialist endorsement can be taken in any sequence other than the practicum required in the final semester. The team recommends the unit consider adding prerequisites (for example, early literacy development and instruction prior to assessment or instructional planning). The team further recommends the unit details how candidates at different developmental stages are assessed on attainment of unit standards to ensure a course progression that allows students to experience courses with increasing content depth.

Unit Response. Thank you for the recommendation. When the University of Iowa's dyslexia specialist endorsement program was originally instituted beginning in 2021, it was cohort-based, with one round of admissions each year and courses were delivered in a four-session sequence (fall, spring, summer and fall). Each of the six courses was offered only once in the sequence for each cohort. In connection with this response to the draft final report, the unit has submitted a revised curriculum exhibit consisting of the same six courses that were included in the program during the 2021 through 2024 academic years. Faculty considerations for future offerings will include sequencing of the courses and whether course prerequisites are needed to establish the sequencing.

Department Response. See response to 79.10(3) above.

Unit Response. Thank you again for the recommendation relating to the sequencing of dyslexia specialist courses. At present, the University of Iowa's dyslexia specialist added endorsement program K-12 has no enrolled students. At the point that additional students enroll, the program will implement the recommended course prerequisite if it is necessary to ensure that the practicum course is taken in students' last semester in the program.

As the program was originally offered at the University of Iowa, the program was cohort based and each course was offered in a fixed four-session sequence (fall, spring, summer, fall); because of this, a course prerequisite for EDTL:6172 Advanced Reading Clinic Practicum had not been required to ensure that it was the last course in the sequence. Students will be asked to complete EDTL:6171 prior to completing EDTL:6172.

Findings/Concerns

1. 79.13(5) The team found evidence that while the teacher preparation program has a well-developed assessment system, administrator and other professional programs lack comparable systems for ongoing candidate and program evaluation. The team requires the unit to allocate resources to strengthen assessment practices, including interrater reliability practices, in these programs to ensure consistent quality across all areas.

Unit Response. Like the monthly presentations to faculty and staff on various aspects of the TEP, referred to as TEP Sessions, we plan to hold similar sessions this academic year that pertain to the responsibilities of all educator preparation programs (EPP Sessions). Sessions would include one or more opportunities for faculty and staff to discuss required aspects of educator preparation assessment systems and to provide an opportunity for the CoE's director of assessment and continuous improvement to share information on data trends and best practices for analysis and action.

In addition, the director of assessment and continuous improvement will conduct a workshop for all educator preparation programs on standardization, validation and interrater reliability in our assessment systems.

The educational leadership program is implementing monitoring and feedback on standards as part of its web-based assessment system, Tk20. Logs, reflections and feedback for clinical experiences already are conducted in Tk20. See also the response to the administrator clinical concern, number two, 79.16(4)c, relating to the program's log as it relates to assessment of clinical experiences.

Further plans of the educational leadership program include to develop common rubric for assessment for the purpose of standardizing levels of performance and increasing interrater reliability of assessment data, comparable to the common rubric that has been in use in the University of Iowa's TEP for a number of years; and development of a web-based, secure data site, to provide administrators and faculty with access to an array of tools for assessment of program data, comparable to an existing TEP data site.

Development of more robust assessment practices in the preparation programs for the professional service license will be an ongoing activity of the Professional Service Advisory Committee. See also the responses to governance number two 79.10(4) and assessment concern number two 79.13(6), relating to the Professional Service Advisor Committee.

Department Response. Please provide an update on the unit's progress on holding similar "TEP sessions" for the administrator and other programs, the workshop for standardization, validation and interrater reliability and the common rubric.

Unit Response. Thank you for the request for follow-up. As a first installment of these sessions, the CoE's director of assessment and continuous improvement has developed a video summarizing reliability, validity and standardization that is being disseminated to all licensure programs. The video will be shared with faculty and administrators of the educator preparation programs, with the educational leadership and professional service programs, to assist faculty in their ongoing development of candidate assessment and their ongoing unit assessment.

2. 79.13(6) While the school social work program conducts a survey of graduates, they acknowledge through the self-study process that graduates' employers are not included. The team did not find evidence that the speech language pathology program surveys recent graduates nor employers. The team requires the unit to develop a process and implementation timeline to address the survey requirements for both programs.

Unit Response. The Professional Service Advisory Committee will be utilized as a group to disseminate information about a standardized timeline and process for the survey of graduates and employers. The director of assessment for the CoE will create a schedule and timeline for the development, the dissemination and the analysis of the survey to be used by all programs in the educator preparation program. The unit will report on progress at the one-year review.

Department Response. Please provide a schedule and timeline mentioned in the unit's response.

Unit Response. The first meeting of the Professional Service Advisory Committee of the 2025-2026 academic year was postponed due to planned staff transitions; a new staff member who will support the committee's work joined the CoE's staff in February 2026.

The committee held their first meeting just prior to this report and will be holding another in April or May. We anticipate that the agenda for this meeting will include review of a draft survey and refinement of a timeline for the survey's use. The assessment video created by the CoE's director of assessment and continuous improvement will also be used to inform the committee's work.

Sources of Information

Interviews with: President, dean, associate provost, graduate college dean, associate dean for undergraduate education and educator preparation, director for assessment and continuous

improvement, licensure and standards coordinator, educational licensure specialist, advising and student support, coordinator of teacher education program admissions, coordinator of graduate student admissions

Review of: Institutional report, program response to the preliminary review, student records, surveys, course syllabi, handbooks, program opening presentation, assessment system overview

TEACHER EDUCATION CLINICAL PRACTICE STANDARD

281—79.14(256) Teacher preparation clinical practice standard. *The unit and its school partners shall provide field experiences and student teaching opportunities that assist candidates in becoming successful teachers in accordance with the following provisions.*

79.14(1) *The unit ensures that clinical experiences occurring in all locations are well-sequenced, supervised by appropriately qualified personnel, monitored by the unit, and integrated into the unit standards. These expectations are shared with teacher candidates, college/university supervisors, and cooperating teachers.*

79.14(2) *PK-12 school partners and the unit share responsibility for selecting, preparing, evaluating, supporting, and retaining both:*

- a. High-quality college/university supervisors, and*
- b. High-quality cooperating teachers.*

79.14(3) *Cooperating teachers and college/university supervisors share responsibility for evaluating the teacher candidates' achievement of unit standards. Clinical experiences are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' attainment of unit standards.*

79.14(4) *Teacher candidates experience clinical practices in multiple settings that include diverse groups and diverse learning needs.*

79.14(5) *Teacher candidates admitted to a teacher preparation program must complete a minimum of 80 hours of pre-student teaching field experiences, with at least 10 hours occurring prior to acceptance into the program.*

79.14(6) *Pre-student teaching field experiences support learning in context and include all of the following:*

- a. High-quality instructional programs for PK-12 students in a state-approved school or educational facility.*
- b. Opportunities for teacher candidates to observe and be observed by others and to engage in discussion and reflection on clinical practice.*
- c. The active engagement of teacher candidates in planning, instruction, and assessment.*

79.14(7) *The unit is responsible for ensuring that the student teaching experience for initial licensure:*

- a. Includes a full-time experience for a minimum of 14 weeks in duration during the teacher candidate's final year of the teacher preparation program.*
- b. Takes place in the classroom of a cooperating teacher who is appropriately licensed in the subject area and grade level endorsement for which the teacher candidate is being prepared.*
- c. Includes prescribed minimum expectations and responsibilities, including ethical behavior, for the teacher candidate.*
- d. Involves the teacher candidate in communication and interaction with parents or guardians of students in the teacher candidate's classroom.*
- e. Requires the teacher candidate to become knowledgeable about the Iowa teaching standards and to experience a mock evaluation, which shall not be used as an assessment tool by the unit, performed by the cooperating teacher or a person who holds an Iowa evaluator license.*
- f. Requires collaborative involvement of the teacher candidate, cooperating teacher, and college/university supervisor in candidate growth. This collaborative involvement includes biweekly supervisor observations with feedback.*
- g. Requires the teacher candidate to bear primary responsibility for planning, instruction, and assessment within the classroom for a minimum of two weeks (ten school days).*

h. Includes a written evaluation procedure, after which the completed evaluation form is included in the teacher candidate's permanent record.

79.14(8) *The unit annually offers one or more workshops for cooperating teachers to define the objectives of the student teaching experience, review the responsibilities of the cooperating teacher, and provide the cooperating teacher other information and assistance the unit deems necessary. The duration of the workshop shall be equivalent to one day.*

79.14(9) *The institution enters into a written contract with the cooperating school or district providing clinical experiences, including field experiences and student teaching.*

Initial Team Findings – Teacher Clinical Practice

Commendations/Strengths

- The elementary reading practicum model including concurrent methods instruction, the practicum seminar and weekly supervisor observations is exemplary and demonstrates commitment to quality preparation.
- Involvement of a student support coordinator to assist students in crisis, who may be struggling, is commendable while also being seen as a valuable resource by faculty.

Recommendations

1. 79.14(1) The team found evidence, through candidate interviews and survey responses, that some secondary programs have students develop lesson plans and teach in clinical settings before completing related methods courses or require candidates to complete their practicum immediately before student teaching. Alumni suggested that a series of clinical experiences spread throughout the program would have better prepared them for student teaching. The team recommends reviewing the sequencing of courses and field experiences to ensure pedagogy courses are taken before or alongside practical application. The team also recommends integrating pre student teaching clinical experiences throughout the program to provide multiple opportunities for planning, teaching and assessment prior to student teaching.

Unit Response. All of University of Iowa's preparation programs for secondary school teachers include pre-student teaching clinical experiences, which are structured variously by each program area as one or more standalone practicum courses, as embedded requirements in methods, other program courses or both. All pre-student teaching clinical experiences are supervised, include work with cooperating teachers and are integrated into the overall progression. Each program area proposes titles for its courses, without a standardized naming convention, so it may not be evident from course titles alone which courses deliver instruction in methods of teaching and which include requirements for clinical experiences. As part of a framework for continuous improvement in the preparation programs for secondary school teachers, we are working to make sure all programs have at least two separate clinical experiences prior to student teaching that are embedded in, concurrent with or after courses that provide instruction in methods of teaching, instructional planning and assessment.

Findings/Concerns

None.

Sources of Information

Interviews with: Associate dean for undergraduate education and educator preparation, academic department executive officers, director for assessment and continuous improvement, licensure and standards coordinator, educational licensure specialist, faculty, adjuncts, cooperating teachers, cooperating supervisors, candidates, alumni, advisory committee, elementary and secondary program leads, advising and student support, curriculum council, director of field experiences, coordinator of student field experiences, academic program coordinator for teaching and learning, coordinator of teacher education program admissions, recruitment coordinator

Review of: Institutional report, program response to the preliminary review, student records, surveys, course syllabi, handbooks, program opening presentation, assessment system overview

TEACHER EDUCATION KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND DISPOSITIONS STANDARD

281—79.15(256) Teacher candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions standard. *Teacher candidates demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn in accordance with the following provisions.*

79.15(1) *Each teacher candidate demonstrates the acquisition of a core of liberal arts knowledge including but not limited to English composition, mathematics, natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities.*

79.15(2) *Each teacher candidate receives dedicated coursework related to the study of human relations, cultural competency, and diverse learners, such that the candidate is prepared to work with students from diverse groups, as defined in rule 281—79.2(256). The unit shall provide evidence that teacher candidates develop the ability to identify and meet the needs of all learners, including:*

- a. Students from diverse ethnic, racial and socioeconomic backgrounds.*
- b. Students with disabilities. This will include preparation in developing and implementing individualized education programs and behavioral intervention plans, preparation for educating individuals in the least restrictive environment and identifying that environment, and strategies that address difficult and violent student behavior and improve academic engagement and achievement.*
- c. Students who are struggling with literacy, including those with dyslexia.*
- d. Students who are gifted and talented.*
- e. English language learners.*
- f. Students who may be at risk of not succeeding in school. This preparation will include classroom management addressing high-risk behaviors including, but not limited to, behaviors related to substance abuse.*

79.15(3) *Each teacher candidate demonstrates competency in literacy, to include reading theory, knowledge, strategies, and approaches; and integrating literacy instruction into content areas. The teacher candidate demonstrates competency in making appropriate accommodations for students who struggle with literacy. Demonstrated competency shall address the needs of all students, including but not limited to, students with disabilities; students who are at risk of academic failure; students who have been identified as gifted and talented or limited English proficient; and students with dyslexia, whether or not such students have been identified as children requiring special education under Iowa Code chapter 256B. Literacy instruction shall include evidence-based best practices, determined by research, including that identified by the Iowa reading research center.*

79.15(4) *Each unit defines unit standards (aligned with InTASC standards) and embeds them in courses and field experiences.*

79.15(5) *Each teacher candidate demonstrates competency in all of the following professional core curricula:*

- a. Learner development. The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.*
- b. Learning differences. The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.*
- c. Learning environments. The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.*

- d. Content knowledge. The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.*
- e. Application of content. The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.*
- f. Assessment. The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.*
- g. Planning for instruction. The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.*
- h. Instructional strategies. The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.*
- i. Professional learning and ethical practice. The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.*
- j. Leadership and collaboration. The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.*
- k. Technology. The teacher candidate effectively integrates technology into instruction to support student learning.*
- l. Methods of teaching. The teacher candidate understands and uses methods of teaching that have an emphasis on the subject and grade-level endorsement desired.*

79.15(6) Assessment requirements.

- a. Each teacher candidate must either meet or exceed a score on subject assessments designed by a nationally recognized testing service that measure pedagogy and knowledge of at least one subject area as approved by the director of the department of education, or the teacher candidate must meet or exceed the equivalent of a score on an alternate assessment also approved by the director. That alternate assessment must be a valid and reliable subject-area-specific, performance-based assessment for preservice teacher candidates that is centered on student learning. The required passing score will be determined by the director using considerations described in Iowa Code section 256.16(1)"a"(2) as amended by 2019 Iowa Acts, Senate File 159, section 2. A candidate who successfully completes the practitioner preparation program as required under this subparagraph shall be deemed to have attained a passing score on the assessments administered under this subparagraph even if the department subsequently sets different minimum passing scores.*
- b. The director shall waive the assessment requirements in 79.15(6)"a" for not more than one year for a person who has completed the course requirements for an approved practitioner preparation program but attained an assessment score below the minimum passing scores set by the department for successful completion of the program under 79.15(6)"a." The department shall forward to the BOEE the names of all candidates granted a waiver for consideration for a temporary license.*

79.15(7) Each teacher candidate must complete a 30-semester-hour teaching major which must minimally include the requirements for at least one of the basic endorsement areas, special education teaching endorsements, or secondary level occupational endorsements. Additionally, each elementary

teacher candidate must also complete a field of specialization in a single discipline or a formal interdisciplinary program of at least 12 semester hours. Each teacher candidate meets all requirements established by the board of educational examiners for any endorsement for which the teacher candidate is recommended.

79.15(8) *Each teacher candidate demonstrates competency in content coursework directly related to the Iowa Core.*

79.15(9) *Programs shall submit curriculum exhibit sheets for approval by the board of educational examiners and the department.*

Initial Team Findings – Teacher Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions

Commendations/Strengths

- The team commends the unit for providing candidates with strong opportunities to develop competency in the professional core, including support for those who initially struggle. This support includes resources such as the Student Success Coordinator, goal setting, progress monitoring, learning contracts and advising services. The team also recognizes the valuable contributions of the Baker Teacher Leader Center.

Recommendations

1. 79.15 The team noted overlap between the reading endorsement courses and dyslexia specialist endorsement courses. The overlap may be impacting the intended rigor of the various endorsements. The team recommends the program consider opportunities for collaborative review of the dyslexia specialist endorsement and reading endorsement by the different entities to adjust the rigor to the appropriate levels.

Unit Response. We believe this to be a misconception. There is no overlap in course requirements and options between the proposed program for the K-12 dyslexia specialist endorsement and the proposed programs for the K-8 reading endorsement or the 5-12 reading endorsement. Based on feedback from the Department and the review team, a revised curriculum exhibit for the K-12 dyslexia specialist endorsement has been submitted. This curriculum exhibit represents the original course structure of the University of Iowa's dyslexia specialist program, as it had been submitted and approved by the IRRC, the Department and the BoEE and as it had been offered beginning in the fall 2021 semester. Prior to 2022, two courses that are included the K-12 dyslexia specialist curriculum, EDTL:6171 Advanced Reading Clinic Techniques and EDTL:6172 Advanced Reading Clinic Practicum, had been available as practicum options in the curricula of the K-8 reading endorsement and the 5-12 reading endorsement programs. These pre-2022 offerings of the courses do not satisfy requirements of the K-12 dyslexia specialist program. The practicum requirements of the K-12 dyslexia specialist program are satisfied only by "dyslexia specialist" sections of the courses; these sections of the courses are restricted to candidates who have been admitted to the dyslexia specialist added endorsement program.

2. 79.15(2)b The team found evidence of IEP instruction in EDTL:4900 Foundations of Special Education and through interviews, candidates validated this learning. Alumni survey results and interviews with candidates in the elementary and secondary programs indicate that alumni and candidates would appreciate hands-on experiences to better understand IEPs in their role as classroom teachers. The team recommends the unit embed content in IEP preparation throughout the program.

Unit Response. Thank you for the recommendation. This expressed need from our students has been communicated to the instructors of EDTL:4900 Foundations of Special Education. At present, one module within EDTL:4900, module three, is dedicated to IEPs. Writing an IEP is not included in the module's assignments, but the teacher candidates are provided with examples of an IEP and the application activity that is part of the assignment requires the teacher candidates to review an IEP and answer questions.

The need for teacher candidates to have practical experience with IEPs has also been communicated to instructors of pre-student teaching practicum and student teaching courses. Our further goal is to encourage cooperating teachers in pre-student teaching clinical experiences to work with students on practical applications of understanding and implementing IEPs in school settings.

Department Response. The team commends the additional element of working with cooperating teachers as an effort to close the loop after the preparation being provided by the unit after sharing examples of IEPs and the application activity to see IEP examples and practices in the field. The team recommends the unit considers incorporating a formal process (for example, required element in a clinical) to ensure candidates follow through on your further goal.

Unit Response. Thank you for the recommendation. We will explore this recommendation with the faculty co-leaders of the elementary education program and with the secondary education program board.

Findings/Concerns

1. 79.15(2)f The team found evidence, through syllabi review and interviews, that not all candidates are receiving instruction explicitly addressing behaviors related to substance use disorder. The team requires adding language from this substandard to core curriculum so that all candidates receive instruction in this area.

Unit Response. In past offerings of the course, EDTL:4900 Foundations of Special Education, substance use disorder has been addressed in various modules. Beginning with offerings of EDTL:4900 in the winter 2025 session, as part of a refresh of the course, the special education faculty have ensured that the module pertaining to students with emotional and behavioral disorders explicitly addresses substance use disorders and have updated the syllabus to reflect this change. The review team has been provided with the updated syllabus for EDTL:4900. See also the response to governance and resources, concern number four 79.10(10), for additional details on the refresh of EDTL:4900.

2. 79.15(3) The team found evidence from stakeholder surveys and interviews with supervising faculty that candidates would benefit from additional preparation in phonics and explicit instruction prior to practical application in the field. The team requires the unit review elementary phonics content, materials, strategies, experiential applications and assessments (candidate's preparedness to identify and meet the needs of learners), in addition to the sequence of learning related to field experiences to increase preparedness in the phonics literacy pillar.

Unit Response. Following the site visit, beginning in the summer 2025 session, the elementary education program's literacy faculty have been engaged in analysis and revision of the course objectives, materials and instruction within the program's literacy sequence of courses. This work is ongoing. The review team has been provided with the elementary literacy revision - action plan and the latest updates of the elementary literacy revision - course standards worksheet for the two early-literacy methods of instruction courses of the program, EDTL:3160 Primary Reading and Language Arts Methods, K-3 and EDTL:3164 Intermediate Reading and Language Arts Methods, 3-6. In addition to course overviews, required texts and the course's learning objectives, these worksheets provide an alignment between the TEP core principles with the standards-based learning objectives of the courses and the course activities that contribute to teacher candidate learning related to those principles, standards and objectives. The worksheets also describe the relationship of the course to the other courses of the elementary education literacy curriculum and include a table indicating the concepts from the Workbook that are addressed or assessed in the course. The first round of University of Iowa's FORT scores was above the state average. The unit will analyze the test data for insights that might support continuation or revision of the elementary education program's literacy instruction practices. Course syllabi and instructional materials are updated each semester based on insights from the ongoing analysis and revision. The review team have been provided with the fall 2025 syllabi of EDTL:3160 and EDTL:3164. We anticipate sharing additional formative and summative work at the one-year follow-up to program approval.

3. 79.15(3) The team was provided the Course Alignment Planning Tool (CAPT) to show alignment with evidence-based reading instruction. Interviews with students and faculty as well as review of syllabi and course schedules, shows a lack of representation of alignment with the document. The unit is required to revise and update syllabi, course schedules and course materials (for example, assignments, PowerPoints, textbooks, assessment/rubrics) to demonstrate literacy preparation aligned with components outlined in Chapter 79 and does not include the three-queuing approach for foundational literacy preparation.

Unit Response. The elementary education program's literacy faculty have been engaged in analysis and revision of the course objectives, materials and instruction within the program's literacy sequence of courses. This work is ongoing. The review team was provided with the elementary literacy revision action plan and the latest updates of the course standards worksheet for the two early-literacy methods of instruction courses including required texts and the course's learning objectives. The worksheets also map course progression of concepts and include a table indicating the concepts from the Workbook that are addressed or assessed in the course. The first round of the University's FORT scores was above the state average. The unit will analyze the test data for insights that might support continuation or revision of the elementary education program's literacy instruction practices. Faculty have been advised of the administrative rules provision regarding literacy instruction and practical application that "preparation shall not include instruction or practical application on teaching foundational reading that incorporates the three-cueing system." Course syllabi and instructional materials are updated each semester based on insights from the ongoing analysis and revision. The review team have been provided with the fall 2025 syllabi of EDTL:3160 and EDTL:3164. We anticipate sharing additional formative and summative work at the one-year follow-up to program approval.

Department Response. The team recommends that the unit consider adopting literacy textbooks aligned with Science of Reading principles, rather than relying on the exclusion of balanced literacy content, to reduce potential candidate confusion.

Unit Response. Thank you for the recommendation. We understand that this recommendation stems from selection by our literacy faculty of a textbook that had been included on, but subsequently was removed from, the list of recommended textbooks that is published by an organization that was recommended to us by the Department. A screenshot of the webpage, which included the selected text was provided. The University of Iowa CoE continues its work to examine and enhance its instruction in early literacy. This spring 2026 semester, a member of the early literacy faculty has been given release time from teaching to review current early literacy curricula and materials, examine other possible materials and recommend program changes. Goals of this review include ensuring that the University of Iowa's elementary teacher candidates are well-prepared for their role in teaching early literacy, that they are confident in taking the FoRT and that they can meet expectations set by state policy makers and by the school leaders who will employ them

Sources of Information

Interviews with: Associate dean for undergraduate education and educator preparation, academic department executive officers, licensure and standards coordinator, educational licensure specialist, candidates, advising and student support, director of field experiences, coordinator of student field experiences, academic program coordinator for teaching and learning, director of the baker teacher leader center, coordinator of teacher education program admissions

Review of: Institutional report, program response to the preliminary review, student records, surveys, course syllabi, program opening presentation

ADMINISTRATOR PREPARATION CLINICAL PRACTICE

281—79.16(256) Administrator preparation clinical practice standard. *The unit and its school partners shall provide clinical experiences that assist candidates in becoming successful school administrators in accordance with the following provisions.*

79.16(1) *The unit ensures that:*

a. Principal candidates successfully complete clinical experiences that provide candidates with opportunities to synthesize and apply the knowledge and skills identified in subrule 79.17(2) in ways that approximate the full range of responsibilities required of building-level leaders and enable them to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult in their school.

b. Superintendent candidates successfully complete clinical experiences that provide candidates opportunities to synthesize and apply the knowledge and skills identified in subrule 79.17(3) in ways that approximate the full range of responsibilities required of district-level leaders and enable them to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult in their district.

79.16(2) *The unit ensures that clinical experiences occurring in all locations are coherent, authentic, sustained, and purposeful opportunities that are monitored by the unit. These expectations are shared with candidates, supervisors and cooperating administrators.*

79.16(3) *Candidates are supervised by knowledgeable and qualified practitioners. The PK-12 school and the unit share responsibility for selecting, preparing, supporting, evaluating, and retaining both:*

a. High-quality college/university supervisors, and

b. High-quality cooperating administrators.

79.16(4) *Cooperating administrators and college/university supervisors share responsibility for evaluating the candidate's achievement of unit standards. Clinical experiences are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' attainment of unit standards.*

79.16(5) *Clinical experiences include all of the following criteria:*

a. A minimum of 400 hours during the candidate's preparation program.

b. Take place with appropriately licensed cooperating administrators in state-approved schools or educational facilities.

c. Take place in multiple high-quality educational settings that include diverse populations and students of different age groups.

d. Include documented expectations and responsibilities for cooperating administrators, school districts, accredited nonpublic schools, or AEAs and for higher education supervising faculty members.

e. Provide opportunities for candidates to apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions identified in subrules 79.17(2) and 79.17(3).

79.16(6) *The institution annually delivers one or more professional development opportunities for cooperating administrators to define the objectives of the field experience, review the responsibilities of the cooperating administrator, build skills in coaching and mentoring, and provide the cooperating administrator other information and assistance the institution deems necessary. The professional development opportunities incorporate feedback from participants and utilize appropriate delivery strategies.*

79.16(7) *The institution shall enter into a written contract with the cooperating school districts that provide field experiences for administrator candidates.*

Initial Team Findings - Administrator Clinical

Commendation/Strength

- The team commends the EPLS faculty for designing clinical experiences that immerse participants in diverse leadership experiences through interactions across a comprehensive list of administrative roles. With a wide range of on-site supervisors, students gain exposure to varying leadership styles and strategies, enhancing their ability to consider and adopt effective, adaptable approaches.

Recommendations

None.

Findings/Concerns

1. 79.16(3) Through interviews and review of documents, the team found evidence that the mid-point conversation with the candidate and university supervisor was the only formalized mechanism for assessment involving the cooperating administrator. The team requires the unit to develop and implement a plan that ensures clinical assessments are structured so cooperating administrators and university supervisors share responsibility for evaluating the candidate's achievement of unit standards through multiple assessments at key points within the program.

Unit Response. The educational leadership program faculty have developed new clinical assessment practices and forms, the CCA, for the semester-long clinical experiences of the master of arts, principal preparation (MA) and education specialist, superintendent preparation (EdS) programs. In each semester-long clinical experience, the student, on-site cooperating administrator and university clinical supervisor will meet to discuss and evaluate student progress on the NELP standards, using the forms. In the MA program, the CCA has been implemented for the fall 2025 semester in all four of the program's semester-long clinical experiences. The CCA has begun to be implemented in the EdS program's clinical experiences. In the fall 2025 semester, the CCA is in use in one of the program's semester-long clinical experiences, EPLS:6404 Central Administration Clinical. In the spring 2026 semester, the CCA will be implemented in the two EdS clinical experiences that are offered; and in subsequent semesters the CCA will be used in all semester-long EdS clinical experiences. The review team has been provided with CCA forms of the MA and EdS programs.

2. 79.16(4)c The team found evidence, through the institutional report, preliminary review and interviews, that the tracking of candidate's clinical experiences taking place in multiple educational settings that include diverse populations is not being tracked. The unit is required to continue developing a tracking system that is maintained and utilized.

Unit Response. The educational leadership program faculty currently use an hour-log form to document the clinical hours for each student. The hours log is a web-based form within program's assessment system, TK20, and the data that are entered into it are available for analysis by program faculty, administrators and the CoE's director of assessment and continuous improvement. The hour log is used for all courses of the MA and EdS that include a clinical experience, both embedded clinicals (classroom courses that include a small clinical experience requirement) and semester-long clinicals (courses that predominately consist of the clinical experience requirement). The hour log was updated for the spring 2026 semester to include, for each clinical course, a menu for the administrator candidate to indicate the student population(s) they worked with in an activity, for example: regular education, special education, English language learners, at-risk, Title I, talented and gifted; and to specify the grade level of the student population. In addition, the educational leadership program faculty currently use a clinical placement form for each clinical student. The clinical placement form summarizes all the candidate's clinical experiences in the program, including, for each course, the number of clinical hours required and completed, school district placement, school district administration contact information,

cooperating administrator and contact information and the university supervisor assigned to the student. The clinical placement form is retained in the administrator candidate's permanent file.

Sources of Information

Interviews with: Associate dean of school of education, administrator preparation program leads, candidates, unit faculty, adjuncts, cooperating supervisors

Review of: Institutional report, program response to the preliminary review, student records, surveys, course syllabi, handbooks, program opening presentation, assessment system overview

ADMINISTRATOR KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND DISPOSITIONS

281—79.17(256) Administrator knowledge, skills, and dispositions standard. Administrator candidates shall demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn in accordance with the following provisions.

79.17(1) Each educational administrator program shall define program standards (aligned with current NELP standards) and embed them in coursework and clinical experiences at a level appropriate for a novice administrator.

79.17(2) Each principal candidate demonstrates the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to:

- a. Collaboratively lead, design, and implement a school mission, vision, and process for continuous improvement that reflects a core set of values and priorities that include data use, technology, equity, diversity, digital citizenship, and community. (Mission, Vision, and Improvement)
- b. Advocate for ethical decisions and cultivate and enact professional norms. (Ethics and Professional Norms)
- c. Develop and maintain a supportive, equitable, culturally responsive, and inclusive school culture. (Equity, Inclusiveness, and Cultural Responsiveness)
- d. Evaluate, develop, and implement coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, data systems, supports, and assessment. (Learning and Instruction)
- e. Strengthen student learning, support school improvement, and advocate for the needs of the school and community. (Community and External Leadership)
- f. Improve management, communication, technology, school-level governance, and operation systems to develop and improve data-informed and equitable school resource plans and to apply laws, policies, and regulations. (Operations and Management)
- g. Build the school's professional capacity, engage staff in the development of a collaborative professional culture, and improve systems of staff supervision, evaluation, support, and professional learning. (Building Professional Capacity)

79.17(3) Each superintendent candidate demonstrates competency in all of the following professional core curricula:

- a. Collaboratively lead, design, and implement a district mission, vision, and process for continuous improvement that reflects a core set of values and priorities that include data use, technology, values, equity, diversity, digital citizenship, and community. (District Mission, Vision, and Improvement)
- b. Advocate for ethical decisions and cultivate professional norms and culture. (Ethics and Professional Norms)
- c. Develop and maintain a supportive, equitable, culturally responsive, and inclusive district culture. (Equity, Inclusiveness, and Cultural Responsiveness)
- d. Evaluate, design, cultivate, and implement coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, data systems, supports, assessment, and instructional leadership. (Learning and Instruction)
- e. Understand and engage families, communities, and other constituents in the work of schools and the district and to advocate for district, student, and community needs. (Community and External Leadership)
- f. Develop, monitor, evaluate, and manage data-informed and equitable district systems for operations, resources, technology, and human capital management. (Operations and Management)
- g. Cultivate relationships, lead collaborative decision making and governance, and represent and advocate for district needs in broader policy conversations. (Policy, Governance, and Advocacy)

79.17(4) Each new administrator candidate successfully completes the appropriate evaluator training provided by a state-approved evaluator trainer.

79.17(5) Each administrator candidate demonstrates the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to support the implementation of the Iowa core.

79.17(6) Each administrator candidate demonstrates, within specific coursework and clinical experiences, the ability to develop and maintain a supportive, equitable, culturally responsive, and inclusive district culture with students and staff from diverse groups, as defined in rule [281—79.2\(256\)](#). The unit shall provide evidence that administrator candidates develop the ability to meet the needs of all learners, as well as ensuring teachers meet the needs of diverse learners, including:

- a. Students from diverse ethnic, racial and socioeconomic backgrounds.*
- b. Students with disabilities. This will include preparation in developing and implementing individualized education programs and behavioral intervention plans, preparation for educating individuals in the least restrictive environment and identifying that environment, and strategies that address difficult and violent student behavior and improve academic engagement and achievement.*
- c. Students who are struggling with literacy, including those with dyslexia.*
- d. Students who are gifted and talented.*
- e. English language learners.*
- f. Students who may be at risk of not succeeding in school. This preparation will include classroom management addressing high-risk behaviors including, but not limited to, behaviors related to substance abuse.*

79.17(7) *Each administrator candidate meets all requirements established by the board of educational examiners for any endorsement for which the candidate is recommended. Programs shall submit curriculum exhibit sheets for approval by the board of educational examiners and the department.*

Initial Team Findings - Administrator Knowledge Skills and Dispositions

Commendations/Strengths

- The team recognizes the educational leadership team's consistent review of candidate's needs throughout courses and the program. Recently, the program recognized that observed writing skills, through submitted coursework, was not at a level needed for the position of an administrator. The program included additional content and reinforcement of writing skills, essential in the field, for optimal preparation.

Recommendations

None.

Findings/Concerns

1. 79.17(5)c The team found evidence, through the institutional report, preliminary review responses and syllabi, that while students struggling with literacy, including those with dyslexia, is included in EPLS: 6236 Special Education Administration, the content is not represented in the course syllabi. The unit is required to update the EPLS: 6236 syllabi to include preparation for the ability to develop and maintain a supportive building- or district-level environment for literacy practices.

Unit Response. The syllabus of the course, EPLS:6236 Special Education Administration has been updated to specify that literacy and dyslexia are addressed in the context of several topics within the course, including referral and evaluation for special education (Week 5), placement and continuum of services (Week 7), accountability and disproportionality (Week 8), student behavior and discipline (Week 9) and supporting special education staff (Week 11). The review team has been provided with the updated EPLS:6236 syllabus.

Sources of Information

Interviews with: Candidates, past graduates, unit faculty, program coordinators, visit to zoom classroom

Review of: Institutional report, student handbooks, program response to the preliminary review, surveys information through interviews, alumni surveys

OTHER PROGRAM CLINICAL PRACTICE

281—79.20(256) Clinical practice standard. *The unit and its school, AEA, and facility partners shall provide clinical experiences that assist candidates in becoming successful practitioners in accordance with the following provisions.*

79.20(1) *The unit ensures that clinical experiences occurring in all locations are well-sequenced, purposeful, supervised by appropriately qualified personnel, monitored by the unit, and integrated into unit standards. These expectations are shared with candidates, supervisors and cooperating professional educators.*

79.20(2) *The PK-12 school, AEA, and facility partners and the unit share responsibility for selecting, preparing, evaluating, supporting, and retaining both:*

- a. High-quality college/university supervisors, and*
- b. High-quality cooperating professional educators.*

79.20(3) *Cooperating professional educators and college/university supervisors share responsibility for evaluating the candidate's achievement of unit standards. Clinical experiences are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate the candidate's attainment of unit standards.*

79.20(4) *Clinical experiences include all the following criteria:*

- a. Learning that takes place in the context of providing high-quality instructional programs for students in a state-approved school, agency, or educational facility;*
- b. Take place in educational settings that include diverse populations and students of different age groups;*
- c. Provide opportunities for candidates to observe and be observed by others and to engage in discussion and reflection on clinical practice;*
- d. Include minimum expectations and responsibilities for cooperating professional educators, school districts, accredited nonpublic schools, or AEAs and for higher education supervising faculty members;*
- e. Include prescribed minimum expectations for involvement of candidates in relevant responsibilities directed toward the work for which they are preparing;*
- f. Involve candidates in professional meetings and other activities directed toward the improvement of teaching and learning; and*
- g. Involve candidates in communication and interaction with parents or guardians, community members, faculty and staff, and cooperating professional educators in the school.*

79.20(5) *The institution annually delivers one or more professional development opportunities for cooperating professional educators to define the objectives of the field experience, review the responsibilities of the cooperating professional educators, build skills in coaching and mentoring, and provide the cooperating professional educators other information and assistance the institution deems necessary. The professional development opportunities incorporate feedback from participants and utilize appropriate delivery strategies.*

79.20(6) *The institution shall enter into a written contract with the cooperating school districts that provide field experiences for candidates.*

*The University of Iowa prepares practitioners in the following: Professional School Counseling, School Psychology, Speech Language Pathology, School Audiology, School Social Work

Initial Team Findings - Professional School Counseling Clinical

Recommendation

1. 79.20(2) The team found evidence (through syllabi and interviews) the program has clear alignment of course competencies and goals with state and national standards. However, a visual table including specific assignments and assessments in courses that address standard 79.20(2)a-f would be beneficial. The team recommends the unit extend the well-developed curriculum map, with national standards, to also include alignment with state standards.

Unit Response. Thank you for the recommendation. The school counseling faculty will develop a curriculum map that includes the state standards and will plan to share it by the one-year follow-up to the University of Iowa's review.

Findings/Concerns

None.

Sources of Information

Interviews with: Faculty and program coordinator for the professional school counseling program, clinical supervisors, candidates

Review of: Institutional report, program response to the preliminary review, student records, surveys, course syllabi, handbooks, program opening presentation, assessment system overview

OTHER KNOWLEDGE SKILLS AND DISPOSITIONS

281—79.21(256) Candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions standard. Candidates shall demonstrate the content knowledge and the pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn in accordance with the following provisions.

79.21(1) Each professional educator program shall define program standards (aligned with current national standards) and embed them in coursework and clinical experiences at a level appropriate for a novice professional educator.

79.21(2) Each candidate demonstrates, within specific coursework and clinical experiences related to the study of human relations, cultural competency, and diverse learners, that the candidate is prepared to work with students from diverse groups, as defined in rule 281—79.2(256). The unit shall provide evidence that candidates develop the ability to meet the needs of all learners, including:

- a. Students from diverse ethnic, racial and socioeconomic backgrounds.
- b. Students with disabilities. This will include preparation in developing and implementing individualized education programs and behavioral intervention plans, preparation for educating individuals in the least restrictive environment and identifying that environment, and strategies that address difficult and violent student behavior and improve academic engagement and achievement.
- c. Students who are struggling with literacy, including those with dyslexia.
- d. Students who are gifted and talented.
- e. English language learners.
- f. Students who may be at risk of not succeeding in school. This preparation will include classroom management addressing high-risk behaviors including, but not limited to, behaviors related to substance abuse.

79.21(3) Each candidate meets all requirements established by the board of educational examiners for any endorsement for which the candidate is recommended. Programs shall submit curriculum exhibit sheets for approval by the board of educational examiners and the department.

*The University of Iowa prepares practitioners in the following:

Professional School Counseling, School Psychology, Speech Language Pathology, School Audiology, School Social Work

Initial Team Findings - Professional School Counseling Knowledge Skills and Dispositions

Commendation/Strength

- All faculty members in the professional school counseling program have school counseling experiences which positively impacts the experience and preparation of candidates with an educational focus.

Recommendations

None.

Findings/Concerns

None.

Sources of Information

Interviews with: Faculty and program coordinator for the professional school counseling program, clinical supervisors, candidates

Review of: Institutional report, program response to the preliminary review, student records, surveys, course syllabi, handbooks, program opening presentation, assessment system overview

Initial Team Findings - School Psychology Clinical Practice

Commendation/Strength

- Candidates are provided with exceptional opportunities for clinical experiences in a variety of settings including students with diverse needs and a combination of school and clinic experts who support their preparation.

Recommendation

1. 79.20(2) The team found evidence, through syllabi and interviews, the program has clear alignment of course competencies and goals with state and national standards. However, a visual table including specific assignments and assessments in courses that address standard 79.20(2)a-f would be beneficial. The team recommends the unit extend the well-developed curriculum map, with national standards, to also include alignment with state standards.

Unit Response. Thank you for the recommendation. The school psychology faculty will develop a curriculum map that includes the state standards and will plan to share it by the one-year follow-up to the University of Iowa's review.

Findings/Concerns

None.

Sources of Information

Interviews with: Academic program coordinator, faculty in educational psychology program, coordinator of graduate student admissions, recruitment coordinator, application developer

Review of: Institutional report, program response to the preliminary review, student records of clinical experiences and assessment throughout the program, surveys, course syllabi, handbooks, program opening presentation

Initial Team Findings - School Psychology Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions

Recommendations

None.

Findings/Concerns

None.

Sources of Information

Interviews with: Academic department faculty, program coordinator, candidates

Review of: Institutional report, program response to the preliminary review, student records, alumni and cooperating professional surveys, course syllabi, program handbooks, program opening presentation

Initial Team Findings – Speech Language Pathology Clinical Practice

Recommendations

None.

Findings/Concerns

None.

Sources of Information

Interviews with: Faculty, adjuncts, school audiology program lead, speech language pathology program lead, department executive officer of the department of communication sciences and disorders, licensure and standards coordinator, associate dean for undergraduate education and educator preparation

Review of: Institutional report, program response to the preliminary review, student records, surveys, course syllabi, handbooks, program opening presentation, assessment system overview

Initial Team Findings – Speech Language Pathology Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions

Recommendation

1. 79.20(2)a-f After a review of syllabi and interviews with faculty, the team identified an opportunity to show inclusion of some content required from Chapter 79 within existing courses. The team recommends considering how the program might reduce credits and thus be more approachable for more candidates by developing a crosswalk of program competencies that are already embedded in existing courses.

Unit Response. Thank you for the recommendation. We welcome the opportunity to make the education licensure more accessible to our speech language pathology students. We will plan to engage in a collaborative review of the courses available within the speech language pathology Master's program to determine if they address additional school licensure competencies that could substitute for CoE courses. We will plan to share an update at the one-year follow-up to the University of Iowa's review.

Findings/Concerns

None.

Sources of Information

Interviews with: Faculty, adjuncts, school audiology program lead, speech language pathology program lead, department executive officer of the department of communication sciences and disorders, licensure and standards coordinator, associate dean for undergraduate education and educator preparation

Review of: Institutional report, program response to the preliminary review, student records, surveys, course syllabi, handbooks, program opening presentation, assessment system overview

Initial Team Findings - School Social Work Clinical

Commendations/Strengths

- The team commends the school social work program for the redesign of the clinical assessment system based on candidate feedback.
- The school social work faculty are dedicated to maintaining quality preparation across multiple modalities that are available state wide.

Recommendation

1. 79.19(1) Through review of the institutional report, survey responses and interviews with alumni, the team found inconsistency in the quality of clinical placements when requiring the candidate to find an appropriate location. The team recommends the program evaluate the practicum placement process and consider development of a network of school districts across the state with appropriately licensed school social workers to ensure quality and equity in clinical experiences for all candidates.

Unit Response. Thank you for the recommendation. Our program has a “student-choice” model for practicum (clinical placement) selection, meaning that candidates choose from a list of established practicum sites. As is noted in the review team’s report, some students experience challenges identifying a site from the list, which we believe is typically due to their geographic location or supervisor availability. Since the last review, the school of social work established an online Master of social work program, which has grown rapidly. We serve geographically dispersed students in Iowa and neighboring states. Each year, students are hoping to find a practicum placement in a community where we have not previously developed relationships. Practicum supervisor availability changes are another structural barrier to our student-choice model of practicum placement. Both the Covid-19 pandemic and funding changes for schools and AEAs have created increased uncertainty and turnover among school social workers, reducing practicum opportunities. Some are leaving school social work for other opportunities. For those who stay, contracts often change from year to year, with school social workers potentially assigned to a new set of schools or even a different school district. As a result, previously consistent practicum instructors choose not to accept a student to learn their new roles and build new relationships before supervising a student again.

We have implemented two program changes to improve students’ experiences in choosing a practicum. First, due to our growth, we are establishing new relationships with AEAs and schools, especially those further from our in-person program centers, thus growing the choices for students. Second, we moved to an online practicum management system in 2025, called Sonia, which improves site identification. Sonia also helps us plan. We now can identify the geographic areas of school social work endorsement candidates to communicate early with sites that are a good fit. The two changes described above aim to reduce the burden on candidates and ensure equitable access to quality practicum experiences. We will continue to monitor the effectiveness of these approaches. If it is not effective, we will consider creating and maintaining a more comprehensive database of school social work practicum sites and appropriately licensed school social workers.

Findings/Concerns

1. 79.19(2) The team did not find evidence, through the institutional report and interviews, that cooperating practicum instructors and the university supervisor share responsibility for evaluating candidates. The practicum instructor alone scores each required competency, provides narrative feedback and assigns the grade. The team requires the school social work program to develop a policy and process for university personnel to share in the responsibility of evaluating candidate attainment of clinical competencies.

Unit Response. Thank you for raising this concern. We are glad to supplement and clarify the information the review team received at the site visit. We believe that the school social worker program meets the expectation for shared responsibility of evaluating candidates.

For each student's practicum experience, two members of the university faculty have substantive roles in the evaluation of the candidate's performance. The university supervisor is a faculty liaison and site visitor who monitors, gives feedback and approves the practicum instructor's (cooperating teacher) competency score and narrative feedback of candidates. The practicum administrator is the faculty member who oversees all aspects of practicum at each program type/location (Iowa City, Des Moines, Online, Sioux City). The practicum administrator assigns a final grade to the practicum course based on the site visitor and practicum instructor's competency score and narrative feedback. Additionally, a concurrent practicum seminar course is required with practicum. The practicum seminar instructor is a university faculty member who provides feedback and grades students in assignments in which they integrate practicum learning. For example, students develop a service improvement plan for their practicum agency and present an ethical case from practicum and get consultation and support. The seminar instructor grades all seminar assignments. This structure ensures shared responsibility in evaluating candidate competencies and aligns with the standard's expectations.

2. 79.19(3)b The team did not find evidence that the school social work program ensures clinical locations include diverse populations and different age groups of students. The team requires the school social work program to create a procedure to collect and document data to meet the criteria of this standard for each candidate's clinical placement.

Unit Response. Thank you for identifying this concern. We agree that engaging with diverse students is essential for preparing future school social workers. While we are confident that our candidates are working with diverse populations and different age groups of students, we recognize that we are not collecting data that sufficiently demonstrates this. To address this concern, we are implementing a new learning plan for practicum in school social work. The plan will ask candidates to report on the schools and grade levels they served as well as some basic demographic data, such as the free and reduced lunch rates for each of their schools. At the site-level, the practicum administrators will review this data at the end of each semester of school social work practicum. If a students' site is not sufficiently diverse, the administrator will work with the site visitor and the practicum instructor to identify additional learning opportunities and populations to ensure compliance with this standard.

Sources of Information

Interviews with: Associate dean for undergraduate education and educator preparation, programs and admissions manager, endorsement program coordinator, practicum education director, social work program director and director of distance education, faculty, cooperating supervisors, candidates, alumni

Review of: Institutional report, preliminary review program responses, student records, surveys, course syllabi, handbooks, program opening presentation, assessment system overview

Initial Team Findings - School Social Work Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions

Recommendation

1. 79.20(2)a-f The team found evidence, through syllabi and interviews, of an opportunity to differentiate content in the professional education course requirements for school social work candidates in preparation to work with varying student populations. The team recommends the CoE collaborate with school social work faculty to identify alternate opportunities and assignment variations that will allow students in school social work to engage in content and demonstrate learning in the general education, special education and elective courses through a social work lens.

Unit Response. Thank you for the recommendation. The current education requirements of the school social worker program were selected for relevance to the work of future school social workers. The education courses are inclusive to all types of licensure students, not just teacher education. We will continue to explore this issue through the Professional Service Advisory Committee.

Findings/Concerns

None.

Sources of Information

Interviews with: Associate dean for undergraduate education and educator preparation, programs and admissions manager, endorsement program coordinator, practicum education director, social work program director and director of distance education, faculty, cooperating supervisors, candidates, alumni

Review of: Institutional report, program response to the preliminary review, student records, surveys, course syllabi, handbooks, program opening presentation, assessment system overview

Initial Team Findings - School Audiologist Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions

Recommendations

None.

Findings/Concerns

None.

Sources of Information

Interviews with: Faculty, adjuncts, school audiology program lead, speech language pathology program lead, department executive officer of the department of communication sciences and disorders, licensure and standards coordinator, associate dean for undergraduate education and educator preparation

Review of: Institutional report, program response to the preliminary review, student records, surveys, course syllabi, handbooks, program opening presentation, assessment system overview

Initial Team Findings - School Audiologist Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions

Recommendation

1. 79.20(2)a-f After a review of syllabi and interviews with faculty, the team identified an opportunity to show inclusion of some content required from Chapter 79 within existing courses. The team recommends considering how the program might reduce credits and thus be more approachable for more candidates by developing a crosswalk of program competencies that are already embedded in existing courses.

Unit Response. Thank you for the recommendation. We welcome the opportunity to make the education licensure more accessible to our audiology students. We will plan to engage in a collaborative review of the courses available within the Doctor of Audiology program to determine if they address additional school licensure competencies that could substitute for CoE courses. We will plan to share an update at the one-year follow-up to the University of Iowa's review.

Findings/Concerns

None.

Sources of Information

Interviews with: Faculty, adjuncts, school audiology program lead, speech language pathology program lead, department executive officer of the department of communication sciences and disorders, licensure and standards coordinator, associate dean for undergraduate education and educator preparation

Review of: Institutional report, program response to the preliminary review, student records, surveys, course syllabi, handbooks, program opening presentation, assessment system overview

PARAEDUCATOR ORGANIZATION, DIVERSITY, FACULTY, PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND CLINICAL PRACTICE STANDARDS

281—80.9 Organizational and Resources Standards *“Organization and resources shall adequately support the preparation of paraeducator candidates to enable them to meet state standards in accordance with the provisions of this rule.”*

281—80.10 Diversity Standards *“The unit shall ensure that the paraeducator preparation program meets the following diversity standards.”*

281—80.11 Faculty Standards *“Unit staff qualifications and performance shall facilitate the unit’s role in the preparation of a professional paraeducator in accordance with the provisions of this rule.”*

281—80.12 Program Assessment and Evaluation Standards *“The unit’s assessment system shall appropriately monitor individual candidate performance and use that data in concert with other program information to improve the unit and its programs in accordance with the provisions of this rule.”*

281—80.13 Clinical Practice Standards *“The unit and its school partners shall provide clinical experience opportunities that assist candidates in becoming successful paraeducators in accordance with the provisions of this rule.”*

Initial Team Findings – Para-educator Standards

Commendations/Strengths

- UI's REACH program offers resources and training for college-age students with intellectual, cognitive and learning disabilities. Recently they modified the curriculum for Paraeducator Certificate, to provide the training with the same rigor to the candidates with disabilities, through additional preparation and time needed to reinforce the learning and provide for hands-on experience in para educator roles. This option provides the opportunity for individuals with disabilities who meet the requirement of the program to pursue paraeducator roles and support students in K-12 schools.

Recommendations

None.

Findings/Concerns

None.

Sources of Information

Interviews with: Program leadership, candidates, unit faculty, program coordinator

Review of: Paraeducator report, program opening presentation
